

EATAW 2021

11th Conference of the European
Association for the Teaching
of the Academic Writing

online

*The residence of writing
and writing support*

book of abstracts

July 7–8, 2021
Ostrava, Czech Republic



Contents

Welcome to EATAW 2021 5

KEYNOTE LECTURES

Digital writing and digital humanities – twins, siblings, or cousins? 6
Madalina Chitez & Otto Kruse

Academic writing as multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary ... Transdisciplinary? A view from North America 7
Dylan Dryer

Teaching academic writing in the context of diversity. And has the pandemic made it better or worse? 8
John Harbord

SYMPOSIA

Writing as community: Co-authoring for and about collaborative learning 9
Gordana Dobravic, Alison Farrell, Maria Freddi, Katrin Girgensohn, Erika Melonashi,
Sonia Oliver del Olmo, Íde O’Sullivan, Biljana Šćepanović, Jolanta Šinkūnienė

Stimulating academic writing for publication: Results of an international,
interdisciplinary course for Central European faculty members 10
Angeniet Kam, Lynda Steyne, Agnes Simon, Jan Beneš, Eszter Timár

WORKSHOPS

Generic and specific – an explorative workshop on academic writing in the 2020s 11
Fia Christina Börjeson, Carl Johan Carlsson, Andreas Eriksson, Magnus Gustafsson

Providing social support for students in remote contexts:
Virtual strategies to engage isolated students positively in their writing 12
Mary Davis

Supporting advanced writing processes for graduate students and teaching writing for publication 13
Dana Lynn Driscoll

Creative writing about teaching 14
Katrin Girgensohn

THEMED DISCUSSIONS

Writing tutor development: Challenges and opportunities in the current state of the art 15
Dimitar Angelov, Niall Curry, Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams, Catalina Neculai

Making writing research accessible: Collective research activity across disciplines and levels 16
Tiane Donahue

Talking to the machine: How notions of feedback and plagiarism are challenged by AI-software 17
Ingerid S. Straume, Chris M. Anson

PRESENTATIONS

Text recycling or self-plagiarism?
An analysis of the comparative ethics of professional and student reuse of prior written material 18
Chris M. Anson

Higher education institutions as academic writing communities:
A study based on the analysis of master dissertation titles 19
Luís Filipe Barbeiro, José Brandão Carvalho, Célia Barbeiro

The challenges of internationalization:
A corpus-based model for measuring English-language norms in L1 student writing for writing support 20
Loredana Bercuci, Mădălina Chitez, Claudia Doroholschi

Digital storytelling in the academic writing class: Connecting two forms of literacy in one space	21
Joel Bloch	
Academic writing in the broader context of early career researcher development: Leveraging existing open educational resources with STEMskiller, an annotated guide from the National Library of Technology (NTK) in Prague	22
Alena Choudounská, Stephanie Krueger, Sasha Skenderija	
Optimizing academic writing teachers' understanding of automated rhetorical feedback	23
Elena Cotos	
Teaching students at Central Asian universities who have minimal L1 secondary literacy	24
Konstantinos Dimitriou, Karina Narymbetova, Darina Omurzakova	
Citation practices in L2 learner academic discourse: Form, function and stance of citations in Czech university students master's theses	25
Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova	
How do writing teachers learn to teach writing?	26
Claudia Ioana Doroholschi, Ana Cristina Băniceru	
English for architecture and construction engineering: Comparing Czech and Italian students' writing needs	27
Maria Freddi, Jolana Tlukova	
Writing and thinking: What changes with digitalization?	28
Curtis Gautschi, Otto Kruse, Christian Rapp	
Knowing our students, knowing ourselves: How the backgrounds and challenges of multilingual writers in an international programme can inform our group mentorship and feedback processes	29
Lindsey Gruber	
The effect of teacher written feedback on student use of source materials	30
Alma Jahić Jašić	
Say it in your words!: Student source-use and faculty approaches. Toward a collaborative academic integrity environment	31
Ilkem Kayıcan Dipcin	
Academic writing in the native tongue: Developing the discipline through rhetoric and composition	32
Irina Korotkina	
The art of the possible: From generic to embedded academic literacy development	33
Bente Kristiansen, Stacey M. Cozart	
Differentiating formats: What do we call what we are doing and what does that mean?	34
Eva Kuntschner	
Academic writing in second language: Issues and choices. A case study of Romance languages academic writing in Estonian context	35
Aleksandra Ljalikova, Kristiina Rebane	
No writing courses? No problem: Determining students' writing needs through writing center sessions	36
Warren Merkel	
Agency as a jointly constructed action: An ethnographic study of developing a writing training program at a German university	37
Tetyana Müller-Lyaskovets, Meni Syrou, Olena Horner	
MySupervisor – a program to aid STEM students in academic writing	38
Tzipora Rakedzon, Dima Birenbaum, Yaron Honen, Gary Mataev	
Digital provision for undergraduate proposal writing: Securing conceptual alignment between writer and supervisor when using Thesis Writer	39
Christian Rapp, Otto Kruse	
“In this presentation we report on the development of ...” What we learned about structure of research papers across disciplines from collecting research article phrases for an Academic Phrasebook in another language than English	40
Lotte Rienecker, Peter Stray Jørgensen, Anne Sofie Jakobsen	
Academic writing and retention	41
Ira (Irina) Rupp	

Exploring English academic writing in social sciences and humanities (SSH)
in Polish national journals: An exploratory corpus based study of writing in philosophy 42
Aleksandra M. Swatek

A descriptive report on an English Academic Writing and Research Center for Publication Purposes 43
Hacer Hande Uysal, Batuhan Selvi

The needs of Turkish scholars in writing for publishing purposes in English 44
Hacer Hande Uysal, Batuhan Selvi

Basements, bedrooms, and parking lots: The physical and emotional spaces of writing during a pandemic 45
Bronwyn T. Williams

Academic writing development of master’s thesis pair writers:
The impact of negotiating and assigning writerly identities 46
Tine Wirenfeldt Jensen, Helle Merete Nordentoft, Søren Smedegaard Bengtsen

TEACHING-ORIENTED PRESENTATIONS

They just don’t get it: A referencing error analysis 47
Kristien Andrianatos, Prof Tobie van Dyk

To infinity and beyond: Positioning writing support in universities 48
Monica Broido, Harriet Rubin

Innovative means of teaching referencing: The NWU library’s *Referella* intervention package 49
Anneke Coetzee, Zander Janse van Rensburg

Publish and Flourish: Systemic approach to doctoral writing at VSB-Technical University of Ostrava 50
Kamila Etchegoyen Rosolová, Alena Kašpárková, Eleanor Lurring

Teaching academic writing: Tensions, negotiations and considerations 51
Cathinka Dahl Hambro, Ingerid S. Straume

Writers, writers everywhere, but no writing center: The first year of the Masaryk University Writing Lab 52
Joe Lennon

“But how do I explain that?” Training English writing center peer tutors 53
Natasha Msibi, Ruth Shannon, Rose Jacobs

Beyond reflection: The manifesto in doctoral writing development 54
Tom Muir, Kristin Solli

Developing students’ discipline-based academic literacies during medical education 55
Neslihan Onder-Ozdemir

Reflecting on the digital transformation: A praxeological perspective on writing center work during COVID-19 56
Doris Pany-Habsa

Lessons from the pandemic: Repositioning writing in language learning contexts 57
Daniel Portman, Monica Broido

Responding to changing circumstances: Writing fellows as support for digital introductory lectures 58
Ute Reimers

Transforming STEM education with writing threshold concepts:
Genre, audience and peer review in a physics curriculum 59
Rachel Riedner, William J. Briscoe, Alexander van der Horst, Gary Dane White, Carol Hayes

Using pictures of academic writing to illustrate academic writing processes
for postgraduate and early career researchers 60
Christine Tulley

Making the transformation in academic writing: Some strategies for students from Asian backgrounds 61
Cindy Wee

“Wisely and slow”: An exploration of slowness in the teaching of academic writing 62
Stuart Wrigley

Teaching writing for diverse audiences to doctoral students: An SFL-informed approach 63
Nadya Yakovchuk

Welcome to EATAW 2021

Two years have gone by, and it is time for us to meet again. Because the EATAW conference alternates with the conference of the European Writing Centers Association (EWCA), our plan had been to build on EWCA's theme of "empowerment" in writing centers planned for the meeting in Graz in 2020. However, the covid-19 pandemic hit and EWCA could not take place. A year later, it was far from clear whether EATAW could take place, or in which form. We debated this a great deal, asked you all in a survey and then decided to go online, crossing our fingers that enough people would register. And here we are, ready to see you virtually on **July 7 and 8, 2021** and still connect to EWCA intentions with our theme "**The residence of writing and writing support.**"

If you are wondering about the connection of this theme to empowerment, we were thinking that the various forms and approaches in writing support and writing centers depend on where the support comes from and who provides it. Even though EWCA caters to writing center practitioners and EATAW to teachers, we all deserve to pause and revisit the foundations. More specifically, we should ask seemingly simple questions, some of which have been here for decades but may still be unanswered in certain contexts and/or in contexts that keep changing, such as the following:

Who are we?

- Who are we as teachers of academic writing?
- What do we need to know directly to support academic writers at any level?
- What else do we need to know to teach academic writers so that they can prosper?

Where do we work?

- Where DOES, SHOULD, and COULD writing support reside?
- What are the different models universities have to support writing?
- How is writing support defined?

What is our field?

- (How) has academic writing become a field?
- How do we know?
- How has teaching of writing made a difference in your contexts?

How do technologies help us?

- How digital are we?
- How are we affected by the impact of technologies?
- What has the pandemic taught us about the technologies?

Who are other stakeholders in academic writing support?

- How do libraries approach/support academic writing?
- What is the role of journal editors, publishers, and reviewers?
- Who have we lost, and what new partnerships have we made?

Moreover, our theme explores the essence of our work and professional identity in an unprecedented time of the covid-19 outbreak that has put more things in motion than we could have ever imagined. Therefore, we added the question of:

What has changed recently?

- How has the residence of writing support changed as we have shifted to working remotely?
- What have the quarantines taught us about the particular nature of proximity?
- What have we lost/gained?

We very much appreciate the wide interest of the EATAW community in the topics. We invite you to view this time as an opportunity for self-reflection and exploration of new things, and we are excited to see so many fascinating responses to the theme.

Welcome to EATAW Conference 2021 and enjoy.

Kamila Etchegoyen Rosolová and Alena Kašpárková

On behalf of the EATAW Board and EATAW 2021 Organizing Committee



Digital writing and digital humanities – twins, siblings, or cousins?

Mădălina Chitez & Otto Kruse

In this plenary, we will look at the digitalization of writing practices from two different angles: digital humanities and digital writing. While the field of digital humanities involves, in most cases, the digital collection, repository and analysis of documents, digital writing deals with the computer-supported creation, storage, and exchange of documents. Digitalization reshaped both fields, and what was traditionally separated in two worlds, like the painter and the museum or the writer and the library, today relies on a shared body of technologies usable in both fields. We will give examples from our actual work in either field and show how corpus technology, writing analytics and support measures for writers merged to one unified field of text technology. In this expanding field, from which a new definition of writing can be extracted, seamless interaction of activities such as production, preservation, exchange, design, publication, analysis, feedback, takes place and can be managed from the same digital work space.

Mădălina Chitez

West University of Timisoara, Romania

Mădălina Chitez is a Senior Researcher in Applied Corpus Linguistics at the West University of Timisoara, Romania. She obtained her PhD in English Philology with a specialisation in corpus linguistics, from Albert-Ludwig University of Freiburg, and worked as a researcher in Germany and Switzerland, with research stays in Italy and the UK, investigating topics in learner corpora, academic writing and contrastive rhetoric. Since returning to her home country, Romania, in 2017, she has been conducting research in the area of corpus related academic writing, digital humanities and computer-assisted language learning. Her current project, ROGER, aims at identifying salient linguistic and rhetoric features of the Romanian student academic writing, from a Romanian-English contrastive perspective, with the help of a bilingual comparable corpus of student texts. She is the Founder and Director of the CODHUS research centre (Centre for Corpus Related Digital Approaches to Humanities), which has a strong interdisciplinary and applicative character.



Otto Kruse

Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland

Otto has a background in psychology and worked in psychological research, student counselling and social work before he became a professor in the field of Applied Linguistics at the Zurich University of Applied Sciences where he was also the director of the Centre for Academic Writing. He specialized in the teaching of academic writing and has taught writing in numerous degree programs and open workshops. He has been a founding member of EATAW and a board member for six years. He was involved in several international research projects exploring writing in European higher education. Since his retirement, his research focuses on the digitalization of writing. Together with Christian Rapp, he created "Thesis Writer", a writing platform to support dissertation writing. His current research interest touches various aspects of the digitalization of writing, particularly the impact of inscription technologies and of digital formulation support on the nature of writing.



Academic writing as multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary ... transdisciplinary? A view from North America

Dylan Dryer

In the wake of the geopolitical and public-health disruptions since 2019, my hope for this talk is to provoke some useful discussion about how we can account for the places, spaces, proximities, technologies, collaborations, and infrastructures that academic writing requires – and that it produces. To get there, I offer a view of North American efforts to achieve disciplinary status for Academic Writing, acknowledging some instructive differences between US and Canadian contexts and sketching the (mixed) results of some recent large-scale efforts to make our field more legible to academic and external audiences. From one perspective, differences in the working conditions of academic-writing professionals constitute a powerful centrifugal force working against disciplinary coherence. Depending on how we answer questions (like those EATAW asks us to reconsider for 2021: “Where do we work?” or “What is our field?”), we’ll arrive at quite different answers to the question “Who are we?”. Yet from another perspective, such differences point to the unique nature of Academic Writing’s object of inquiry. As we know, academic-writing conventions are indissociable from matters of epistemology, ontology, and history; as we also know, the teaching and learning of these conventions are impossible to separate from questions of access and identity. The work of Academic Writing, therefore, does not lie outside of or adjacent to existing disciplines; it engages the fundamental question of disciplinarity itself.

Dylan Dryer

University of Maine, USA

Dylan Dryer is Associate Professor of Composition Studies at the University of Maine, where he currently directs the Graduate Program in English and serves as the Associate Director for Research and Program Assessment of the first-year writing program. An alumnus of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (2007), he works from a home-base in rhetorical genre studies to explore applications in corpus analytics, writing pedagogy and assessment, cognition, teacher-training, and language ideologies. With continuing-education in research methods a long-standing priority in teaching and in service, he’s currently working on book, tentatively titled *After Solipsism: Writing Studies and the Promise of Intersubjectivity*.



Teaching academic writing in the context of diversity. And has the pandemic made it better or worse?

John Harbord

What does it mean to be a teacher of academic writing in Europe? What, who and how do we “teach”, and in what sense is it “academic”? In contrast to most writing-related organisations in the United States, EATAW brings together practitioners not only from widely different backgrounds, working with students and scholars in different disciplines, but in different languages and within different national education systems. If we are to support writers in higher education, is there a best way to do so, or is every context so different that we can only occasionally borrow each other’s ideas? These questions have been popular at every EATAW conference, but now the pandemic has brought new challenges but also new opportunities. In this plenary I explore these issues and opportunities, and consider whether there is or should be a European model of writing support, and how recent events might shape that model.

John Harbord

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Maastricht University, Netherlands

John Harbord is academic writing advisor at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Maastricht University. From 1998 to 2015, he was director of the Center for Academic Writing at Central European University, then located in Hungary. He has worked as a consultant helping to develop writing support programmes, train staff in the disciplines on using writing in their courses, and advising university administrators and education programmes in the Caucasus, Central Asia, the Balkans, the Czech Republic, and Turkey. His research interests include educational policy relating to language use and plagiarism, and the adaptation of international models of writing support across borders. He has been a member of EATAW since 2001, and was Chair of the organisation from 2003 to 2009.



Writing as community: Co-authoring for and about collaborative learning

Gordana Dobravac, Alison Farrell, Maria Freddi, Katrin Girgensohn, Erika Melonashi, Sonia Oliver del Olmo, Íde O'Sullivan, Biljana Šćepanović, Jolanta Šinkūnienė

Where we could see any silver linings to the wretchedness of living with the global pandemic, they might have been in the extent to which colleagues and communities pulled together to support each other. In our work, we have long believed that we are stronger together and we have sought collaborative opportunities that have brought us together with colleagues, some of whom are entirely new to us, some who represent long standing professional relationships. As an extension of that collaboration, we have capitalised on opportunities to co-author, believing that writing together has far more advantages than disadvantages.

In this symposium we describe how the co-authoring that we completed as part of COST Action 15221 helped us not only to share our Action's learning and outcomes more broadly, through the dissemination of our work, but how that writing together also helped us to both continue our collaboration, to better understand our collaborative learning and to nurture our community. In the symposium we discuss the co-authoring associated with four parts of the Action which in turn involved collaborative learning and micro-communities namely:

- collaborative writing about and within training schools and Short Term Scientific Missions (STSMs)
- collaborative editing and co-authoring of a collection of case studies (O'Sullivan et al., 2020)
- deliberate conversation as part of co-authoring a chapter (Melonashi et al.)
- thinking, talking, and writing – co-authoring using interview (Girgensohn et al.)

We use concept mapping (Gravett, 2020) guided by the Action's 3Cs Professional Learning Framework (COST Action 15221) and Roxå and Mårtensson (2015) work on microcultures to understand our writing and learning processes as we collaborated on these four texts. These understandings revealed insights about our community of writers which may be beneficial for colleagues seeking to use co-authoring for and about collaborative learning.

This symposium is based upon collaborative work by COST Action [members](#), supported by COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology).

References

COST Action 15221, (in press) *Final Action Dissemination (FAD) Report*

Girgensohn, K., Šinkūnienė, J., and Farrell, A. (accepted and in press). Supporting and Encouraging Writing: An interview with dr. Alison Farrell (National University of Ireland Maynooth) and dr. Katrin Girgensohn (European University Viadrina). *EDUCARE journal*.

Gravett, K., Kinchin, I. M., Winstone, N. E., Balloo, K., Heron, M., Hosein, A., Lygo-Baker, S., & Medland, E. (2020). The development of academics' feedback literacy: experiences of learning from critical feedback via scholarly peer review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45:5, 651-665, DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2019.1686749

Melonashi, E., Donovan, P., Ercan, B., Farrell A., & Oliver, S. (under review), 'The challenges of Professional Development in the European Higher Education Area: Targeting success in writing, research, learning and teaching' in Gustafsson, M., & Eriksson, A. *Academic Writing at Intersections in Europe*, WAC Clearinghouse and European Association for the Teaching Academic Writing (EATAW).

O'Sullivan, Í., Dobravac, G., Farrell, A., Kacmarova, A., & Leijen, D. (eds) (2020) *Centralised Support for Writing, Research, Learning and Teaching: Case Studies of Existing Models across Europe*, [pdf]. COST Action 15221: We ReLaTe. Available at: <https://www.maynoothuniversity.ie/centre-teaching-and-learning/ctl-projects/current-ctl-projects/cost-action-15221-we-relate>

Roxå, T., & Mårtensson, K. (2015). Microcultures and informal learning: a heuristic guiding analysis of conditions for informal learning in local higher education workplaces. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 20:2, 193-205, DOI: 10.1080/1360144X.2015.1029929

Gordana Dobravac

Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Pula, Croatia
Dr. Gordana Dobravac has been teaching English, linguistics and, academic reading and writing at the Faculty of Educational Sciences at the Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Croatia. She has a PhD degree in cognitive science and her research interest are the cognitive mechanisms of second language learning, bilingualism, and textbook analysis. She is the author of several papers and dictionaries. Currently she has been involved in the national project Multilevel Approach to Spoken Discourse in Language Development.

Alison Farrell

Maynooth University, Maynooth, Co Kildare, Ireland

Dr. Alison Farrell established the University Writing Centre in Maynooth University in 2011. She is the founding chair of the Educational Developers in Ireland Network (EDIN) and the Irish Network for the Enhancement of Writing (INEW). She was Management Committee Chair of the European COST Action WeReLaTe which explored frontier taxonomies and institutional synergies across writing, research, learning and teaching. She is currently seconded to Ireland's National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education as Senior Lead for Sectoral Engagement. Her research interests include academic writing, collaboration, professional development, and policy and power in higher education.

Maria Freddi

University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy

Maria Freddi is Associate professor of English Language and Linguistics at the University of Pavia, Italy, where she teaches English for Academic Purposes courses (especially English for Science and Technology), corpus linguistics methodology, descriptive grammar and text analysis. In recent years she has been involved in two EU-funded research projects, namely COST Action 15221-WeReLaTe on developing synergies between Writing and Research and Learning/Teaching, as of September 2019, in the Becoming a Digital Global Engineer (BADGE) project aimed at developing language materials for students of engineering in the global digital world.

Katrin Girgensohn

SRH Berlin University of Applied Sciences, Berlin, Germany

Katrin Girgensohn is professor for writing studies and teaches in the BA program for creative writing and text production at SRH Berlin University of Applied Sciences in Berlin. She is also academic director of the writing center at European University Viadrina. For more than 20 years, she researches, practices and teaches writing from different perspectives, like cultural studies, literature and educational studies.

Erika Melonashi

Wisdom University College, Tirana Albania

Associate Professor Erika Melonashi is Dean of the Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences at Wisdom University College in Tirana, Albania. She holds a PhD in Psychology and her research interests lie within the sub-disciplines of Social & Health Psychology as well as Developmental Psychology. Prof. Melonashi has been actively involved in quality assurance processes in higher education, being an external evaluation expert for the Agency of Quality Assurance in Higher Education in Albania. Additionally she is a member of the Commission for Continuous Education, in the Albanian Order of Psychologists. Prof. Melonashi was Management Committee Member of the European COST Action WeReLaTe, as a representative of Albania.

Sonia Oliver del Olmo

Autonomous University of Barcelona (UAB), Bellaterra (Cerdanyola del Vallès), Spain

Dr. Sonia Oliver del Olmo has a degree in Anglo-German Philology (University of Barcelona, 1992) and a PhD in Translation and Interpretation (University Pompeu Fabra, 2004). She has been teaching English for Specific Purposes since the onset of her career especially in the areas of Industrial and Aeronautics Engineering, Nursing, Physiotherapy and Pedagogy. She is a Lecturer in the Department of English and German Philology, where she teaches, English for Academic & Professional Purposes and Advanced Academic Abilities module in the Masters Programme. Her research interests include: Corpus Linguistics, Intercultural & Professional Communication, Genre Analysis, Academic English Writing and Critical Literacy.

Íde O'Sullivan

University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland

Dr. Íde O'Sullivan is Curriculum Development Lead at the Centre for Transformative Learning at the University of Limerick. Íde teaches Curriculum Design and leads three scholarship modules on the Graduate Diploma in Teaching, Learning and Scholarship. Íde established the Regional Writing Centre at UL. She is a founding member of the Irish Network for the Enhancement of Writing, elected secretary of the executive committee of the Educational Developers in Ireland Network and a Senior Fellow of the Staff and Educational Development Association. Her current research focuses on curriculum design, professional development, writing transfer, writing pedagogy and assessment, and the institutional work of writing centres.

Biljana Šćepanović

University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro

Biljana Šćepanović, Dr-Ing., educated in the field of civil engineering at the University of Montenegro (Dipl-Ing., 1996; PhD, 2010), University of Belgrade (MSc, 2003) and University of Granada (PhD, 2010; postdoc, 2017), is associate professor at the University of Montenegro (Faculty of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Architecture, Center for Doctoral Studies). Her studying and work experience have been enriched by numerous research and/or teaching mobilities at European universities and by active participation in different international cooperation programmes (Erasmus+, CEEPUS, COST, CGHS, IPA etc.). Domain of teaching and research work as well as of engineering expertise: metal and timber structures.

Jolanta Šinkūnienė

Vilnius University, Lithuania

Dr. Jolanta Šinkūnienė is a linguist and Associate Professor at Vilnius University. She has designed and taught a number of courses aimed at developing writing skills in EAP and ESP, such as Insights into Academic Discourse, Effective Scientific Writing, BA Thesis Writing. She is also a member of the Committee of Humanities and Social Sciences at the Research Council of Lithuania. Her research interests include disciplinary cultures (with a special focus on humanities and social sciences), academic rhetoric, research publication practices, evaluation of research, academic identity aspects.

Stimulating academic writing for publication: Results of an international, interdisciplinary course for Central European faculty members

Angeniet Kam, Lynda Steyne, Agnes Simon, Jan Beneš, Eszter Timár

Central European universities are increasingly confronted with accreditation processes that necessitate faculty to publish their research in international, English language journals. However, academic staff at some of these universities struggle with publishing in English, rather submitting to national journals and, thus, not creating the necessary international impact with their research. At Comenius University in Bratislava (Slovakia), for example, in 2019 faculty published only 34% of their articles and 33% of their books internationally (Comenius University at Bratislava, 2020). Comenius University and Masaryk University (Czech Republic) tackled this problem by offering instructors and researchers (N=20) at the faculties of arts and social sciences a five-day online course on academic writing (Comenius University in Bratislava, 2021a; Masaryk University, 2021). In this symposium, we show how this course was set up and evaluated, and we engage the audience in a discussion on how to further develop (the teaching of) academic writing in (Central) Europe.

The Academic Writing for Publication course set out to strengthen the participants' knowledge about and skills in writing journal articles in English, and to exchange ideas about teaching academic writing. It was taught by five experienced teachers from five European universities and was facilitated by an Erasmus+ grant (Comenius University at Bratislava, 2021b). Though from different disciplinary and national backgrounds, we found common ground in teaching academic writing from a Swalesian genre approach (Swales, 2004; Feak & Swales, 2011; Swales & Feak, 2012). One result of our collaboration is an Academic Writing Glossary (Kam et al., work in progress).

We plan to give five mini presentations about:

- organising the course in an online setting
- finding common ground and developing teaching materials
- managing class discussion and giving feedback
- evaluating the course
- broadening the scope: setting up an academic writing special interest group in Central Europe.

Afterwards, an international panel will discuss with the audience how they successfully gave an impulse to academic writing at their own university or in their country. This symposium is of interest to everyone at (Central) European universities who would like to have their university or faculty more involved in (the teaching of) academic writing.

References

- Comenius University at Bratislava (2020). *Výročná správa o činnosti a hospodárení fakulty za rok 2019* [Annual report on the activities and management of the faculty for the year 2019]. Bratislava: Filozofická Fakulta, Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave.
- Faculty of Arts Comenius University at Bratislava. (n.d.). *Impact*. <https://fphil.uniba.sk/services/impact>
- Faculty of Arts Comenius University in Bratislava. (n.d.). *Academic Writing for Publication*. <https://fphil.uniba.sk/en/services/impact/academic-writing-for-publication>
- Feak, C., & Swales, J. (2011). *Creating Contexts: Writing Introductions Across Genres*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Kam, A., Simon, A., Steyne, L., & Timár, E. (work in progress). *A (non-definitive) Glossary of Academic and Scientific Writing Terms*.
- MUNI Cerpek Pedagogical Competence Development Center. (2020, October 19). *Academic Writing for Publication. Call for applications*. <https://cerpek.muni.cz/en/educational-courses/effective-teaching-for-intl-students>.
- Swales, J. (2004). *Research Genres: Explorations and Applications*. Cambridge.
- Swales, J., & Feak, C. (2012). *Academic Writing for Graduate Students*. Ann Arbor: Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Angeniet Kam

Delft University of Technology, Delft, Netherlands

Angeniet Kam has been teaching academic writing for more than 30 years at different universities in the Netherlands, for the past fifteen years at the Centre for Languages and Academic Skills at Delft University of Technology. She was co-founder of the Dutch Network for Teachers of Academic Communicative Skills and has been an Education Fellow at Delft University of Technology, with a two-year grant to innovate academic writing practice on campus. Though Angeniet is first and foremost a teacher of academic writing, her research interests lie in the field of the effect of psychological ownership on the uptake of feedback in student writing.

Lynda Steyne

Comenius University in Bratislava, Slovakia

Linda (Lyn) M. Steyne is based at the Department of British and American Studies at the Faculty of Arts of Comenius University, where she heads up the English language teaching programme. She has taught academic writing since 2005, at both the secondary and tertiary levels, as well as establishing and coordinating an undergrad writing centre at a liberal arts college in Bratislava. Currently, apart from second language writing and intercultural communicative competence, Lyn's interests lie in pre- and in-service training of English language teachers for both the Slovak state school system and language schools wherever they may be.

Agnes Simon

Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

Agnes Simon is a political scientist who currently works as an Evaluation Research Team Leader in the Pedagogical Competence Development Centre (CERPEK) at Masaryk University. She specialises in US foreign policy, summit diplomacy, Central European politics, and teaching and learning political science. In the past four years, she has worked as an academic developer including curriculum development and mentoring. She is passionate about academic writing in higher education and taught academic writing to undergraduate and graduate students as well as faculty members in the United States, Moldova, and Central Europe.

Jan Beneš

Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

Jan Beneš is an assistant professor at the Department of English and American Studies at the University of Ostrava and an adjunct professor at Masaryk University in Brno. His research focuses on the Harlem Renaissance era. He teaches African American history and culture and has also taught writing-heavy courses in British and American literatures. While pursuing his graduate degree at Texas A&M University, he taught academic and technical writing courses for students of STEM fields and later used this experience in teaching similar courses at the Central European Institute of Technology or the European Educational Research Association summer school.

Eszter Timár

Central European University/Budapest-Vienna, Budapest, Hungary

Eszter Timár has been an Academic Writing instructor at the Budapest-based Central European University since 2002. She has worked with students from various departments, teaching writing skills to groups, running individual consultations, and developing course material for social scientists. Because of her interest in cultural differences in academia, she has also been involved in several outreach projects in the region, as well as in Turkey and Myanmar. Prior to joining CEU, she worked for the English Department of Eötvös Loránd University, the Bell Language School, and the College for Foreign Trade. In addition to teaching, she edits and proofreads on a regular basis.

Generic and specific – an explorative workshop on academic writing in the 2020s

Fia Christina Börjeson, Carl Johan Carlsson, Andreas Eriksson, Magnus Gustafsson

This explorative workshop aims to investigate the continuum between generic and specific academic writing education, with a focus on pedagogic and didactic approaches within academic writing and academic writing teaching in different educational settings.

The workshop rationale is grounded in an attempt to address three of the central themes of the conference: *Who are we? Where do we work? What is our field?* The idea is to inventory and critically discuss our role(s) as teachers of academic writing, the variety of our institutional contexts, the complexity of our field, and the need for continuous development in the face of the changes and challenges of modern universities. Workshop participants will leave the workshop with examples from colleagues and strategies or tools for deciding the appropriate position on the continuum for any course activity.

The workshop facilitators will give examples of the continuum of learning activities from the generic to the specific via various integrated content and language (ICL) activities in a WID (Writing in the Disciplines) context. The workshop participants will share perspectives on generic and specific writing instruction from their own institutional situations. This inventory of perspectives is intended to begin to explore the potential for common ground in order to further explore definitions and conceptualizations of academic writing teaching.

Participants will discuss ways of applying specific academic writing activities within their own teaching practices and institutional contexts. Workshop facilitators will provide cases for discussion as well as prompts for participant descriptions and analyses of writing development activities from their contexts. We will also discuss academic writing as an indispensable part of learning and scientific processes, with the intention of comprising disciplinary ownership.

Workshop participants are encouraged to share their views and negotiate different approaches to academic writing, as the intended outcome of the discussions is to provide a better understanding of the field. With the beginnings of a shared conceptual toolbox for the generic – specific continuum, perhaps we can articulate draft content of an EATAW guideline for academic writing development in the 2020s?

Fia Christina Börjeson

Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden

Fia Christina Börjeson is a senior lecturer at the Department for Communication and Learning in Science, at Chalmers University of Technology in Gothenburg, Sweden. She teaches writing at the undergraduate programs at Chalmers and coordinates the integrated communication interventions in the university's bachelor thesis project.

Carl Johan Carlsson

Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden

Carl Johan Carlsson is a senior lecturer at the Department of Communication and Learning in Science at Chalmers University of Technology. He is involved in technical communication and academic writing in several engineering disciplines. His main interests include various aspects of writing and communication in higher education, integrated and cross-disciplinary learning, disciplinary socialization, pedagogical development work and curriculum design.

Andreas Eriksson

Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden

Andreas Eriksson is an associate professor and head of the Division for Language and Communication at the Department for Communication and Learning in Science.

Magnus Gustafsson

Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden

Magnus Gustafsson is an associate professor at the Division for Language and Communication, Department for Communication and Learning in Science. Magnus teaches academic writing across levels and disciplines. He meets students and faculty in their respective contexts and negotiates the varying degree of problems as students translate the generic to their respective specific contexts in a number of teams and courses. He also teaches on the faculty training programme with a focus on writing development.

Providing social support for students in remote contexts: Virtual strategies to engage isolated students positively in their writing

Mary Davis

The pivot to online teaching and learning brought on by the pandemic has meant that academic writing teachers and their students are physically separated and both working remotely from campus on a long-term basis. For the student, the absence of physical learning spaces, company from classmates and face-to-face support has been found to contribute to a sense of isolation; for example, in a Swiss-based study, Elmer et al. (2020) reported that as interaction and co-studying networks in the pandemic became fewer, students' levels of stress, anxiety and loneliness increased. Previous research has emphasized the need to socialize writing in progress (Murray, 2015) and the value of 'socially supported writing interventions' (Malone et al., 2020, p.108) involving close working in writing groups. Therefore, at present, one of the ongoing challenges for academic writing teachers is to continue to develop that social support in a remote teaching context.

The aim of this workshop is to identify some virtual strategies to reduce isolation among student writers (of any university level), for discussion and evaluation among academic writing teacher participants. These include establishing networks of peer support with writing buddies and critical friends, promoting blog writing and reviewing, providing opportunities for engagement with writing events such as online retreats and workshops, individual planning and goal-oriented checking-in points for process monitoring by writing teachers and sharing recommendations for creating positive writing spaces.

Participants in the workshop will be invited to assess what the pandemic has taught them about being close or remote to their students, and how to make best use of technologies as part of learning support, through discussion and evaluation of the proposed strategies and any of their own strategies to support isolated students and a final poll to establish their usefulness. Participants will be given a take-away in the form of a list of source-based recommendations to apply these strategies to their practice.

References

Elmer, T., Mepham, K., & Stadtfeld, C. (2020). Students under lockdown: Comparisons of students' social networks and mental health before and during the COVID-19 crisis in Switzerland. *PLoS ONE* 15(7), 1-22.

Malone, C., Coleman, C., Freeman, E., & Jamison-Powell, S. (2020). Embedding Academic Literacies through Growing Student and Staff Communities. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 10(1), 98-112.

Murray, R. (2015). *Writing in Social Spaces: A Social Processes Approach to Academic Writing*. Routledge.

Mary Davis

Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, UK

Mary Davis is a Senior Lecturer at Oxford Brookes University where she teaches academic writing to Pre-Master's students. She holds a PhD in Education from IOE, University of London, for which she researched the development of source use in postgraduate student writing. Her research interests focus on different aspects of academic writing including academic integrity and understanding plagiarism, the use of formulaic phrases, overcoming writer's block and the demystification of the writing process.

Supporting advanced writing processes for graduate students and teaching writing for publication

Dana Lynn Driscoll

This interactive workshop explores how to support writers and writing processes when teaching advanced graduate writers, through an in-depth examination of how to transition graduate students from student writers to expert professional writers. While this workshop is geared toward those who teach and support writing for publication in a variety of disciplines, the takeaways from the workshop are also appropriate for those supporting thesis and dissertation writers. Specifically, this workshop focuses on how to help transition graduate to independent expert writers by focusing in two directions: supporting and developing expert writing processes and helping graduate writers work through difficulties surrounding their existing writing processes. The first angle includes a body of research-supported practices (including her own ongoing research on professional writers) to offer a range of practices and suggestions for supporting writers as they work through stages of the writing process: invention/idea generation, drafting and textual production, revision and recursion, and proofreading/submission. The second focus discusses how to support student writers in transitioning to effective expert processes, including addressing unhelpful habits developed from years of coursework with short deadlines, such as binge writing, procrastination, and challenges with self-efficacy and imposter syndrome. Participants will have an opportunity to explore their own writing processes and consider how these experiences may be used as tools for teaching their students. Participants will also have an opportunity to co-develop teaching strategies and activities for supporting different stages of the process. Through these discussions and materials shared by the presenter, participants will leave the workshop with a variety of new strategies to teach writing for publication and support advanced graduate writers in a variety of other academic writing contexts.

References

- Belcher, W. L. (2019). *Writing your journal article in twelve weeks: A guide to academic publishing success*. University of Chicago Press.
- Driscoll, D. L. (In preparation). *Carving out the Article: A Guide for Writing for Publication*.
- Driscoll, D. L. Planning, Tinkering, and Writing to Learn: A Model of Planning and Discovery as Composing Styles for Professional Academic Writers. *Revision under review for Edited Collection*.
- Ericsson, K. A., Hoffman, R. R., & Kozbelt, A. (Eds.). (2018). *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kamler, B., & Thomson, P. (2014). *Helping doctoral students write: Pedagogies for supervision*. Routledge.
- Kellogg, R. T. (2006). Professional writing expertise. In Ericsson, K. A., Charness, N., Feltovich, P. J., and Hoffman, R. R. (Eds) *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance*, (p. 389-402). Cambridge University Press.
- MacLeod, I., Steckley, L., & Murray, R. (2012). Time is not enough: Promoting strategic engagement with writing for publication. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(6), 641-654.
- Nolan, R., & Rocco, T. (2009). Teaching graduate students in the social sciences writing for publication. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(2), 267-273.
- Powell, R., & Driscoll, D. L. (2021). How mindsets shape response and learning transfer: A case of two graduate writers. *Journal of Response to Writing* (6:2), 42-68.
- Silvia, P. J. (2007). *How to write a lot: A practical guide to productive academic writing*. American Psychological Association.
- Wells, J. M., & Söderlund, L. (2018). Preparing Graduate Students for Academic Publishing: Results from a Study of Published Rhetoric and Composition Scholars. *Pedagogy*, 18(1), 131-156.
- Zerubavel, E. (1999). *The clockwork muse: a practical guide to writing theses, dissertations, and books*. Harvard University Press.

Dana Lynn Driscoll

Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, Pennsylvania, USA

Dr. Dana Lynn Driscoll is a Professor of English at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, where she directs the Kathleen Jones White Writing Center and teaches in the Composition and Applied Linguistics doctoral program. Her scholarly interests include composition pedagogy, writing centres, writing transfer and writerly development, expert writers, and research methodologies. Her work has appeared in journals such as *College Composition and Communication*, *Written Communication*, *Writing Center Journal*, and *Writing Program Administration*. She currently serves as a co-editor of *Writing Spaces*, an open-source textbook for college composition.

Creative writing about teaching

Katrin Girgensohn

I would like to invite participants to write creatively, picking up three essential questions from EATAW's cfp: Who are we? Where do we work? What has changed recently?

For me, what has changed recently, is my perspective on teaching writing. Coming from teaching academic writing, I now teach creative writing. My background in writing research and (academic) writing pedagogy helps me very much. However, I can also see how vice-versa creative writing could help teachers of academic writing, for example for their development as reflective teachers.

In this workshop we write creative nonfiction, using a creative writing procedure that is called Braining Technique (Fitzgerald, 2013; Walker, 2017). The topic of your texts will be your experiences as teachers. I will get you started with specific writing prompts and there will be sharing of your beginnings of first drafts in small groups. It will be possible to write in different languages if you do not feel comfortable with creative writing in English. You will leave this workshop with an idea how to continue your work on this piece at home.

References

Walker, N. (2017, Summer). *The Braided Essay as Social Justice Action*. <https://www.creativenonfiction.org/writing/the-braided-essay-as-social-justice-action/>

Braiding Your Writing – Waverly Fitzgerald. (2013, July 9). <https://www.waverlyfitzgerald.com/articles/articles-on-writing/braiding/>

Katrin Girgensohn

SRH Berlin University of Applied Sciences, Berlin, Germany

Katrin Girgensohn is professor for writing studies and teaches in the BA program for creative writing and text production at SRH Berlin University of Applied Sciences in Berlin. She is also academic director of the writing center at European University Viadrina. For more than 20 years, she researches, practices and teaches writing from different perspectives, like cultural studies, literature and educational studies.

Writing tutor development: Challenges and opportunities in the current state of the art

Dimitar Angelov, Niall Curry, Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams, Catalina Neculai

Reflecting the essence of EATAW 2021's conference theme, 'the residence of writing and writing support', this themed discussion will be stimulated by a panel led by Coventry University's *Centre for Academic Writing*. The session will be interactive and create a space to discuss complex issues facing contemporary academic writing tutor development. Initially, the discussion will focus on the challenges of enculturating writing tutors into their relevant communities of practice, discourse communities, and research networks. Recognising the immutable changes through which the field of Academic Writing has gone in recent years and the many related fields (e.g. Education, Academic Literacies, Rhetorical Studies, Applied Linguistics) to which it responds, the challenges of enculturating writing tutors have never been greater. Therefore, the discussion will centre on how these challenges can be overcome through practices such as sustained professional development. In a second area of focus, the panel will address the issue of agency and consider what it is that constitutes a 'writing tutor' in contemporary contexts. This will involve an overview of the range of identities and roles present in academic writing supports, and will offer perspectives on reconciling these apparently disparate roles. In a third and final discussion, the panel will focus on the role of technology in not only revolutionising academic writing support, but also the roles and practices of academic writing tutors. Issues of digital pedagogies, technologies, and digital literacies will permeate this final discussion with a view to offering a number of guidelines, suggestions, and solutions. Overall, the aim of this session is to respond to specific aspects of the conference theme, to offer both practice- and research-based reflections on the challenges in contemporary academic writing tutor development, and create a space for an interactive discussion to share practices and find solutions to emerging challenges.

Dr Dimitar Angelov

Centre for Academic Writing at Coventry University, UK

Dr Dimitar Angelov is an Assistant Professor and Coordinator of Academic Writing Tutors at the Centre for Academic Writing at Coventry University (CU), and leads on designing and delivering professional development activities for Writing Tutors at CU and its subsidiaries. Having graduated with a PhD in Literary Studies at Warwick University, UK, Dimitar has a wide range of scholarly interests, including Poststructuralist and Postcolonial theory, Researcher Development, Higher Education Pedagogy and Multimodality in Academic Writing. He is Course Director of Europe's first MA in Academic Writing Development and Research at CU.

Dr Niall Curry

Centre for Academic Writing at Coventry University, UK

Dr Niall Curry is Lecturer in Academic Writing and ASPIRE Fellow at Coventry University. His research interests include academic writing and metadiscourse, multilingual academic discourse, corpus linguistics, contrastive linguistic, discourse analysis, language change, and language education. He is a *Géras International Correspondent* and co-editor of the *Journal of Academic Writing*. His recent publications include *Academic Writing and Reader Engagement* (2021), published in Routledge's Applied Corpus Linguistics series. This work offers a contemporary and multilingual perspective on reader engagement in academic writing in English, French, and Spanish. For further details on his background, areas of interest, projects, publications, and research, see <https://niallcurry.com/>.

Dr Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams

Centre for Academic Writing at Coventry University, UK

Dr Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams is Head of the Centre for Academic Writing (CAW), Coventry University. In 2004, she led the setting up of CAW as the first institution-wide UK university writing centre. She has taught and tutored students in classrooms and writing centres in the UK and USA, at Bowling Green State University, University of Maine, Miami University, and University of Warwick. She joined EATAW in 2001, hosted the EATAW 2009 Conference, was EATAW Board Chair 2009–2011, and is Editor of the *Journal of Academic Writing*. Lisa's publications include the co-edited *Writing Programmes Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places* (WAC Clearinghouse/Parlour Press 2012).

Dr Catalina Neculai

Centre for Academic Writing at Coventry University, UK

Dr Catalina Neculai is an Assistant Professor in the Centre for Academic Writing (CAW), and an Associate Researcher in the Centre for Arts, Memory and Communities at Coventry University. Catalina joined CAW full time in 2009 after tutoring there for two years while completing her PhD and teaching at the University of Warwick. Catalina has a background in English and French, and a 12-year experience in teaching writing and research writing development. Catalina's research centres on ideologies of writing and knowledge production, and includes articles on academic literacies and neoliberal education, brokering and "the right to academic literacies" ([profile page](#)).

Making writing research accessible: Collective research activity across disciplines and levels

Tiane Donahue

The field of writing studies, however we might name it or describe it in a variety of contexts around the world (didactics of writing; academic literacies; composition-rhetoric; technical or professional writing; content and language integrated learning, to name just a few), draws on multiple disciplines and is interested in multiple complex questions about higher education writing – teaching it and studying it. Various traditional divisions of labor, privileging or marginalization of different disciplines, and understandings or misunderstandings of the relationship between research and teaching and learning, however, leave many writing teachers outside of the writing research community.

In addition, across the university landscape, colleagues in disciplines outside of writing studies tend to be very interested in seeing their students communicate well, but latch onto myths about how we learn to write or personal experience from their own university days. They are understandably dedicated to the content work of their disciplines and may not be actively seeking out what the research about their students' writing has to offer. When they do, they may be unfamiliar with writing research methods and methodologies.

What might we, as a field, do to improve the generalization of knowledge about writing research, to disseminate it broadly among stakeholders without alienating them by a “we know better” attitude or expecting them to read publications in the field, often written for a closed community?

This presentation will describe a set of different kinds of activities that can engage faculty from other disciplines and grade levels as well as faculty who teach writing in positions that do not include research; the activities draw these collaborators into writing research without requiring a full investment as if it were their entire workload, and set them up for questioning and rethinking their practices rather than being passive recipients of research knowledge as published in our journals, edited collections, or monographs.

Tiane Donahue

Dartmouth College, USA

Université de Lille, France

Tiane Donahue is professor of Linguistics and director of the DartWrite digital portfolio initiative at Dartmouth, Hanover, NH, USA. She chairs the International Society for the Advancement of Writing Research, coordinates the Dartmouth Summer Seminar for Writing Research, teaches writing, and focuses on research about writing, translingualism, cross-cultural comparisons, and research methods. She pursued her PhD in Linguistics in France; her work with French research laboratory THEODILE-Cirel (Théorie-Didactique de la Lecture-Ecriture) at l'Université de Lille and her participation in multiple European research projects, networks, conferences and collaborations inform her understanding of writing instruction, research, and program development in European and US contexts.

Talking to the machine: How notions of feedback and plagiarism are challenged by AI-software

Ingerid S. Straume, Chris M. Anson

Plagiarism has traditionally been framed as a moral question and/or a matter of academic-cultural standards. By offering courses in academic integrity combined with software for detection, universities have mainly tried to combat plagiarism as a breach of ethics. Unfortunately, however, the available tools for detecting plagiarism are continually falling behind the technological opportunities for manipulating sources, generating texts that are half-way machine-made, etc. Now, with the introduction of artificial intelligence (AI) in the academic world, a new set of challenges emerges. Consider, for example, the AI-software *Keenious* that is currently promoted to and by university libraries with the following teaser: “Writing a paper? Planning an essay? Searching for references can waste hours of your time.” But as *Keenious* “analyses your entire text and browses through millions of articles, papers, and studies on the web to find the most relevant information in seconds,” you can “say goodbye to hours of manual research.” With this software, the need to search, read, and engage with difficult text material seems to evaporate, while the most “relevant” references are produced by algorithms. In contrast to classical plagiarism, however, the problem is not the absence of citations but rather the opposite. Or consider GPT-3, a much more sophisticated version of the program (developed by the same company, OpenAI) that created Smart Compose, which offers auto-generated sentence completion. Using AI machine learning technology, GPT-3 can write complete natural-language texts (see, for example, Seabrook, 2019). With very minimal editing, outputs generated by GPT-3 are indistinguishable from those written by humans, and can easily be essay-length papers. Because these outputs are created from scratch, they evade plagiarism detection systems. They represent *coherent, structured, readable* prose.

In this themed discussion, the speakers will briefly describe and demonstrate the two AI systems under consideration, then raise questions to engage the audience: How can instructors provide meaningful feedback and encourage writers’ autonomy given the current technological developments such as these? Are there principled ways to revise our pedagogies in order to subvert the possibility of machine-generated material? How – and why or on what grounds – should we encourage the literate work required to learn and to improve one’s writing abilities?

References

- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315-1325. DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354
- Dawson, P. (2017). Assessment rubrics: Towards clearer and more replicable design, research and practice. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(3), 347-360. DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2015.1111294
- Keenious (n.d.) <https://keenious.com/>
- Seabrook, J. (2019, Oct. 14). The next world: Where will predictive text take us? *The New Yorker*. <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2019/10/14/can-a-machine-learn-to-write-for-the-new-yorker>
- Stevens, D. D. Levi, A.J. (2013). *Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback, and promote student learning*. Stylus.
- Wingate, U. (2010). The impact of formative feedback on the development of academic writing. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 519-533. DOI:10.1080/02602930903512909

Ingerid S. Straume

University of Oslo, Norway

Ingerid Straume is director of the writing programme and founder of the writing centre at Oslo University Library. She has a diverse background, and holds a PhD in the philosophy of education with a thesis on Cornelius Castoriadis. Straume has published extensively on the politics and psychology of education, autonomy, identity and recognition. Latest book: *Skriveren og teksten: Fortellinger om identitet og faglig skriving* [The writer and the text: Stories about identity and writing in the disciplines].

Chris M. Anson

North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA

Chris Anson is Distinguished University Professor, Alumni Association Distinguished Graduate Professor, and Director of the Campus Writing and Speaking Program at North Carolina State University, where he teaches graduate and undergraduate courses in language, composition, and literacy and works with faculty across the disciplines to enhance writing and speaking instruction. He has published 19 books and 140 articles and book chapters relating to writing and has spoken widely across the U.S. and in 33 other countries. He is Past Chair of the Conference on College Composition and Communication and Past President of the Council of Writing Program Administrators. His full c.v. is at www.ansonica.net

Text recycling or self-plagiarism? An analysis of the comparative ethics of professional and student reuse of prior written material

Chris M. Anson

Text recycling (TR), sometimes problematically called “self-plagiarism”—is the reuse of textual material in a new document by the same author(s) (Anson, Hall, Pemberton, & Moskovitz, 2020). In a currently funded project, interviews with editors (Pemberton, Hall, Moskovitz, & Anson, 2019) and computational data-mining of TR practice in published articles (Anson, Moskovitz, & Anson, 2019) show that TR is a common practice in scholarly publication in all fields, but that editors and professional societies are conflicted about the practice and do not have uniform standards or policies for it (Anson & Moskovitz, 2020; Moskovitz, 2020; Pemberton, Hall, Moskovitz, & Anson, 2019).

However, our project has deliberately neglected the nature, ethics, and processes of text recycling in schooling. For example, a student who writes up the results of an experiment in Course 1 is not allowed to use any part of that write-up in Course 2, even though they may be repurposing their work into a new genre and focusing in a different way on the results. Similarly, a student may be assumed to be cheating if they use part of a summary of an article from Course 1 in an annotated bibliography in Course 2, even if the material being summarized is relevant to both assignments and contexts.

In this presentation, I will first briefly describe the results of our research into TR in professional academic publishing. I will then turn to the ethics of text recycling in student-facing academic settings, what current pedagogical literature says about such practices, and, based on surveys of university writing program administrators and teachers of academic writing, why standards for student text recycling should or should not be different from those of professional text recycling. Results comparing professional practices with those expected in students’ writing open up important implications for instruction as well as the development of standards in professional and pedagogical settings.

References

- Anson, C. M., Hall, S., Pemberton, M. A., & Moskovitz, C. (2020). Reuse in STEM research writing: rhetorical and practical considerations and challenges. *AILA Review*, 33, 120-135.
- Anson, I. G., & Moskovitz, C. (2020). Text recycling in STEM: A text-analytic study of recent NSF-sponsored research reports. *Accountability in Research*, November, 2020.
- Anson, I. G., Moskovitz, C., & Anson, C. M. (2019). A text-analytic method for identifying text recycling in STEM research reports. *Writing Analytics*, 3, 125-150.
- Moskovitz, C. (2020). There is no absolute expectation about text recycling. *Clinical Biochemistry*, 86, 65-66.
- Pemberton, M. A., Hall, S., Moskovitz, C., & Anson, C. M. (2019). Text recycling: Views of North American journal editors from an interview-based study. *Learned Publishing*, 32(4).

Chris M. Anson

North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA

Chris Anson is Distinguished University Professor, Alumni Association Distinguished Graduate Professor, and Director of the Campus Writing and Speaking Program at North Carolina State University, where he teaches graduate and undergraduate courses in language, composition, and literacy and works with faculty across the disciplines to enhance writing and speaking instruction. He has published 19 books and 140 articles and book chapters relating to writing and has spoken widely across the U.S. and in 33 other countries. He is Past Chair of the Conference on College Composition and Communication and Past President of the Council of Writing Program Administrators. His full c.v. is at www.ansonica.net

Higher education institutions as academic writing communities: A study based on the analysis of master dissertation titles

Luís Filipe Barbeiro, José Brandão Carvalho, Célia Barbeiro

Choices and decisions made when writing academic genres involve several aspects, including those concerning the title, such as linguistic structures, punctuation marks, communicative strategies, length (Hartley, 2005, 2007; Hudson, 2016). These aspects impact the achievement of the socio-communicative objectives of the genre and the projection the text may attain among the scientific community (Fox & Burns, 2015; Jamali & Nikzad, 2011; Whissel, 2012). The preparation of a dissertation or a thesis implies some decisions regarding the title, involving both students and advisors. This presentation describes a study focused on the titles of master dissertations produced by students of pre-service teacher training master programmes in four Portuguese Higher Education institutions. In addition to characterizing the titles and identifying their predominant features, it aims at verifying whether such features can be considered as identity and distinctive marks of each institution, viewed as an academic writing community. The study, based on a corpus of 800 master dissertations, consisted of a comparative analysis of the titles, considering the following aspects: number of elements; structure; communicative strategies; length; other indicators provided by the Corpus Linguistics, such as word frequency, collocations and keywords. According to the results, there are differences between the HE institutions regarding some aspects of the titles: number of elements, syntactic-semantic structures, strategies and keywords. The predominance of certain choices, according to the HE institution, may suggest that each institution constitutes itself as a local academic writing community with its identity characteristics, even if they are not explicitly stated. Further research, focusing on other aspects, such as the structure and content of dissertations, would contribute to a better characterization of such communities. By being aware of these characteristics, members of each community may reflect on their practices and consider other possibilities without losing their identity features.

References

- Fox, C., & Burns, C (2015). The relationship between manuscript title structure and success: Editorial decisions and citation performance for an ecological journal. *Ecology and Evolution*, 5(10), 1970–1980. DOI: 10.1002/ece3.1480
- Hartley, J. (2005). To attract or to inform: What are titles for? *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 35(2), 203–213. <https://doi.org/10.2190/NV6E-FN3N-7NGN-TWQT>
- Hartley, J. (2007). There's more to the title than meets the eye: Exploring the possibilities. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 37(1), 95–101. <https://doi.org/10.2190/BJ16-8385-7Q73-1162>
- Hudson, J. (2016). An analysis of the titles of papers submitted to the UK REF in 2014: authors, disciplines, and stylistic details. *Scientometrics*, 109, 871–889. DOI 10.1007/s11192-016-2081-4
- Jamali, H., & Nikzad, M (2011). Article title type and its relation with the number of downloads and citations. *Scientometrics*, 88, 653–661. DOI 10.1007/s11192-011-0412-z
- Whissel, C. (2012). The trend toward more attractive and informative titles: American psychologist 1946–2010. *Psychological Reports*, 110(2), 427–444. DOI 10.2466/17.28.PRO.110.2.427-444

Luís Filipe Barbeiro

School of Education and Social Sciences – Polytechnic of Leiria, Leiria, Portugal

Luís Filipe Barbeiro is a full professor at the School of Education and Social Sciences, Polytechnic of Leiria, and a researcher at the Centre for Studies of General and Applied Linguistics (CELGA/ILTEC). His main areas of research are: literacy, teacher training, writing development, language diversity, metalinguistic consciousness, and learning Portuguese as a foreign language.

José Brandão Carvalho

Research Centre on Education, University of Minho, Braga, Portugal

José Brandão Carvalho is Associate Professor with Habilitation at the Institute of Education, University of Minho, Portugal, and a member of the Reserch Centre on Education (CIEd). He teaches Portuguese Language (L1) Didactics and Academic Writing. His main research is focussed on Language Education and Academic Literacy.

Célia Barbeiro

School of Correia Mateus – Leiria, Portugal

Célia Barbeiro is a teacher of Portuguese Language at the School of Correia Mateus in Leiria and a teacher training supervisor. She is a researcher at the Centre for Studies of General and Applied Linguistics (CELGA/ILTEC). The key topics of her research are: literacy, teacher training, and academic discourse.

The challenges of internationalization: A corpus-based model for measuring English-language norms in L1 student writing for writing support

Loredana Bercuci, Mădălina Chitez, Claudia Doroholschi

In recent years, researchers have pointed to the extensive use of the English language across the world as “sufficient to provoke justifiable concerns around issues of diversity, equity and identity.” (Ferguson, 2007, p. 12) Such concerns are particularly relevant in the countries of the former Eastern bloc, where modernization is often equated with anglicization (Bennett, 2014). This is also the case in Romania where many textbooks or online resources for academic writing draw heavily on English sources, with no policies to guide writing support in Romanian and little understanding of local writing traditions.

In this paper, we build on intercultural rhetoric (Connor et al., 2008) and corpus linguistics to understand the extent to which student writing in L1 Romanian is influenced by English, both as linguistic and academic norm support. Three corpora have been compiled for this purpose: (A) a corpus of thirty novice-writer student essays in Political Science in Romanian (L1-RO-novice), (B) a native-Romanian expert-writing corpus (L1-RO-expert) in the field, (C) a written ESP learner corpus (L2-EN-novice) in the same discipline. A fourth corpus, (D) a native-English AW corpus (L1-EN), e.g. MICUSP-A level, will also be part of the data evaluation. We use a multi-dimensional comparative approach, focusing on typical AW discourse features such as stance (ST), lexical bundles (LB) and discourse organisers (DOs). In the analysis and discussion section of the paper, we also integrate remarks on the distribution of the academic phraseology extracted from the DOs corpus lists, in the ImRAD structure, based on previously compiled academic phrase lists (e.g. Morley, 2017).

Our paper proposes a model for the positioning of anglicised discourse features of Romanian writing on a continuum starting from “typical Romanian” to “typical English”. We will also address implications for writing support, in the wider context of discussions on internationalization and individuality of academic written language.

References

- Bennett, K. (2014). *The semiperiphery of academic writing: Discourses, communities and practices*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Connor, U., Nagelhout, E., & Rozycki, W. V. (2008). *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric*. John Benjamins.
- Ferguson, G. (2007). The global spread of English, scientific communication and ESP: Questions of equity, access and domain loss. *Ibérica* 13, 7–38.
- Morley, J. (2017). *The Academic Phrasebank: an academic writing resource for students and researchers*. E-book. The University of Manchester I3 Limited.

Loredana Bercuci

West University of Timișoara, Timișoara, Romania
Loredana Bercuci is a junior researcher at the Department of Modern Languages of the West University of Timișoara in Romania, where she also teaches English for Specific Purposes in the Political Science Department, as well as Applied Linguistics and American cultural history in the English Department. She holds a Ph. D. in American Cultural Studies. Her research interests include English for Specific Purposes teaching, corpus linguistics, American Studies, and critical theory.

Mădălina Chitez

West University of Timișoara, Timișoara, Romania
Madalina Chitez is a Senior Researcher at the West University of Timisoara, Romania. She holds a PhD in corpus linguistics from Albert-Ludwig University of Freiburg, and has worked as a researcher in Germany and Switzerland. Since her return to Romania, she has been conducting research on corpus-related academic writing, digital humanities, and computer-assisted language learning. One of her current projects, ROGER, aims at identifying linguistic and rhetoric features of student writing, from a Romanian-English contrastive perspective, with the help of a bilingual comparable corpus of student texts. She is the Founder and Director of CODHUS (Centre for Corpus Related Digital Approaches to Humanities).

Claudia Doroholschi

West University of Timișoara, Timișoara, Romania
Claudia Ioana Doroholschi is a lecturer at the West University of Timișoara, where she teaches literature and academic writing. She is coordinator of the Centre for Academic and Professional Writing at the Faculty of Letters, West University of Timișoara, and has been involved in research regarding writing practices and the teaching of writing in Romania. She is a co-editor of *University Writing in Central and Eastern Europe: Tradition, Transition, and Innovation* (Springer, 2018) and has been involved in a number of projects that focused on writing at University level.

Digital storytelling in the academic writing class: Connecting two forms of literacy in one space

Joel Bloch

This paper addresses a role that multimodality can play in the academic writing classroom by connecting academic research papers with a form of multimodality called digital storytelling (Lambert, 2020). Research by Hafner (2015) and Bloch (2015, 2018, 2019) have shown that digital storytelling can be implemented either collaboratively or individually for print or multimodal forms of academic writing. Our pedagogy showed problems the students had with use of voice when borrowing texts. This new pedagogy implemented multimodal and print texts for exploring alternative approaches to using voice and these two threshold concepts (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015; Meyer & Land, 2003). Although the concepts differ in the different literacy contexts, this focus can help the students better understand them. By foregrounding personal stories in the digital story assignments, students became storytellers bringing their own stories and multimodal texts to explore their meanings. This approach was framed by Canagarajah's (2018) use of terms including "bricolage" and "assemblage", challenging traditional approaches to teaching text borrowing and voice.

Multimodality brings new rules, constraints, technological affordances, and laws to the classroom. Because print texts have dominated the literacy of the university, both literacy forms had to be implemented. Since bricolage and assemblage manifested themselves differently in the academic literacies, the students needed to connect these concepts to support the possibility of transfer (e.g. Anson & Moore, 2017). Blogs and storyboards were additionally implemented for reflection in order to support transfer. To explore this implementation, I will analyse three digital stories to illustrate this process and compare implementing both approaches. This research is important for exploring the teaching of academic writing and illustrating using different technologies to link the affordances with the course goals, thus providing alternative perspectives that challenge instructors and students to examine their roles in these spaces.

References

- Adler-Kassner, L., & Wardle, E. (2015). *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*. Ogden, UT: Utah University Press.
- Bloch, J. (2019). Digital storytelling in the L2 graduate writing classroom: Expanding the possibility of personal expression and textual borrowing. In S. Khadka & J.C. Lee (Eds.) *Bridging the Multimodal Gap: From Theory to Practice*, (182-200). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Bloch, J. (2018). Digital storytelling in the L2 academic writing classroom: Expanding the possibilities. *Dialogues*. <https://dialogues.ojs.chass.ncsu.edu/index.php/dialogues/article/view/30/16>.
- Bloch, J. (2015). The use of digital storytelling in an Academic writing course: The story of an immigrant. In M. Roberge, K. M. Losey, & M. Wald (Eds.) *Teaching U.S-Educated Multilingual Writers: Practices from and for the Classroom* (178-204). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2018). Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. *Applied Linguistics*, 39, 31- 54.
- Hafner, C.A. (2015). Remix culture and English language teaching: The expression of learner voice in digital multimodal compositions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49,3, 486-509.
- Meyer, J.H.F., & Land, R.(2003). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: Linkages to ways of thinking and practicing within the disciplines. In G. Gibbs (Ed.) *Improving Student Learning: Improving Student Learning Theory and Practice* (pp. 412-424). Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff.

Joel Bloch

The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA

Joel Bloch has taught composition courses primarily focusing on publishing and academic writing as well as courses on linguistics and literature. He has published books on digital literacy spaces, technology, plagiarism and intellectual property, and digital storytelling. His most recent book, *Digital Spaces for Teaching Multilingual Writing*, has recently been published by Multilingual Matters. He has published papers on plagiarism, argumentation, digital storytelling, and academic writing. He has been a peer reviewer for a variety of academic journals. He has a PhD in rhetoric from Carnegie Mellon University.

Academic writing in the broader context of early career researcher development: Leveraging existing open educational resources with [STEMskiller](#), an annotated guide from the National Library of Technology (NTK) in Prague

Alena Choudounská, Stephanie Krueger, Sasha Skenderija

Many of us working in the area of academic writing in Central European universities at the early career researcher level find ourselves struggling with the boundary of the term “academic writing.” Like a Russian Matryoshka doll, one finds that skill development often requires introducing students to concepts extending far beyond writing, exposing educational gaps that can be filled by disciplinary mentors who may or may not have time to work with mentees on developing the required competencies. This presentation describes an online tool, STEMskiller, developed by NTK to assist mentors in filling in such gaps, describing how its developers confronted the “boundary problem” as a supplement to introductory writing classes. The presentation provides case studies for STEMskiller’s use by academic writing instructors with stories from our initial experiences with mentors and other users. We discuss plans for the tool’s future development, including our desire to serve the global academic community by means of collaborative peer review and resource curation as well as our goal of working together at the cross-institutional, cross-national level in order to improve overall levels of education, particularly for mentors and students at institutions who, for whatever reason, cannot easily create new academic service units flexible enough to meet international disciplinary requirements.

Alena Choudounská

National Library of Technology (NTK) in Prague
Alena Choudounská is head of the Specialized Academic Services Department at NTK. Since 2015, she has been a leader in refining new types of academic services that fit better within a broader mosaic of the Dejvice technology campus and public education in the Czech Republic, with the critical usage of information being just one of the pieces in a greater puzzle. With a background in information science, she aims at supporting all individual users who interact with NTK, seeking ways of inspiring the improvement of the educational system within her area of expertise.

Stephanie Krueger

National Library of Technology (NTK) in Prague
Stephanie Krueger is an independent academic consultant for Fornobia, a project she co-founded together with Sasha Skenderija. She works with students and researchers via (among others) NTK and Prague’s Czech Technical University and University of Chemistry and Technology. With a background in information science and non-profit management, Krueger comes to academic writing with a transdisciplinary, cross-organizational, and cross-national perspective. She is passionate about providing everyone with access to high-quality open educational resources and to giving students and mentors the right tools to perform their work at the highest levels, regardless of where they live or work.

Sasha Skenderija

National Library of Technology (NTK) in Prague
Sasha Skenderija is a senior consultant for advanced academic services at NTK. Skenderija has a background in information science and over 20 years of international experience in academic librarianship. Acting as the NTK head of the user support division during the 2013-2018 period, he played the key role (together with Stephanie Krueger) in envisioning and launching fully bilingual advanced academic services in Czech and English.

Optimizing academic writing teachers' understanding of automated rhetorical feedback

Elena Cotos

Automated writing evaluation (AWE) has encountered criticism (Herrington & Moran, 2012; Perelman, 2012) that requires revisiting a foundational question: How can writing teachers ensure that AWE technologies help us appropriately focus on important traits of writing as communicative practice? This study addresses this question aiming to investigate automated rhetorical feedback targeting the communicative dimension of academic genres. The goal was to identify sources of feedback errors made by a genre-based AWE tool for research writing (Cotos, 2017).

First, student texts in six disciplines were analyzed by two teachers, who annotated each sentence as rhetorical moves (Swales, 1990), and by the AWE tool, which generates sentence-level move feedback. These data were compared to extract sentences where teachers and AWE disagreed. Then, these sentences (597) were analyzed with a focus on n-gram features (6568 unigrams, 6945 trigrams). All the n-grams were manually coded as: indicative of the actual move, indicative of the misclassified move, or non-indicative of any rhetorical intent. Additionally, pre- and post-classification feature metrics for each n-gram were calculated and compared to determine whether individual n-grams contained within a sentence contributed to its erroneous move detection. Finally, each n-gram's qualitative (teachers coding) and quantitative (feature metrics) descriptors were mapped, and possible sources of AWE feedback errors were identified.

The results reveal that AWE rhetorical feedback generation is influenced by linguistic features and that feedback errors are caused by misleading, ambiguous, lacking, underrepresented, and competing n-grams. These findings provide practitioners with transparency regarding what may affect the quality of AWE rhetorical feedback, thus allowing them to better explain it to their students and adapt their practices to appropriately compensate for its shortcomings. More broadly, this study extends the stakeholder role of writing teachers from users to informers of future techniques for augmenting and improving genre-based AWE feedback on student writing.

References

- Cotos, E. (2017). Computer-assisted research writing in the disciplines. In S. A. Crossley & D. S. McNamara (Eds.), *Adaptive educational technologies for literacy instruction* (pp. 225–242). NY: Taylor & Francis, Routledge.
- Herrington, A., & Moran, C. (2012). Writing to a machine is not writing at all. In N. Elliot & L. Perelman (Eds.), *Writing assessment in the 21st century: Essays in honor of Edward M. White* (pp. 219–232). New York, NY: Hampton Press.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perelman, L. (2012a). Mass-market writing assessments as bullshit. In N. Elliot & L. Perelman (Eds.), *Writing assessment in the 21st century: Essays in honor of Edward M. White* (pp. 425–438). New York, NY: Hampton Press.

Elena Cotos

Iowa State University, Ames, USA

Elena Cotos is an Associate Professor in the Applied Linguistics Program, Department of English, and in the interdisciplinary Human Computer Interaction Program at Iowa State University. She is also the Director of the Center for Communication Excellence of the Graduate College. Additionally, she serves as the Book Review Editor for the *English for Specific Purposes* journal. Her research agenda bridges corpus-based genre analysis, genre-based automated writing evaluation, writing pedagogy, and computer-assisted language learning and assessment in English for academic and specific purposes.

Teaching students at Central Asian universities who have minimal L1 secondary literacy

Konstantinos Dimitriou, Karina Narymbetova, Darina Omurzakova

Literacy support in an English-language university in Central Asia helps students with the challenging linguistic demands of tertiary study in a foreign language (Bourdieu & Passeron 1994: 8). The tutors engaged in this language socialisation (LS) process (Duff, 2012) must show an awareness of students' L1 secondary-school literacy to be successful. Our previous study (Dimitriou, Omurzakova & Narymbetova, 2020) looked at the literacy foundations of secondary graduates of the post-Soviet education system of Kazakhstan (Yakontova, 2001; Yassukova, 2020), and found them to be lacking significant experience of in-depth reading-to-writing experience (Keck, 2014; Friedman, 2019), and even rudimentary argumentation, critical thinking (Neff, 2013; Timm, 2008) and literacy metalanguage (Cummins, 2016). This led us to an exploratory study into the socialisation experiences of the students' literacy tutor (author 2) in the Foundation program at our University, a relatively under-explored topic. Our goal was to see how the tutor's perspective on the LS of students could shed more light on their experiences, their writing and her teaching. We used the reflective journaling (Field & Burton, 2012) of this tutor to examine her perspective on the process and key pedagogical issues. We posit that this method could help to establish an approach to the study of LS in Central Asia tertiary Foundation courses (see also Goodman & Montgomery, 2020). Our preliminary findings indicate that a tutor can learn while teaching (Duff & Anderson, 2015) particularly about the students' capabilities, that similarity of background can help an L2-English tutor understand her students' capabilities, that establishing a metalanguage vocabulary through directed practice can produce some success in LS, and that the tutor's perspective on LS can help to add explanatory meaning to students' perspectives.

References

- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1994). Introduction: Language and relationship to language in the teaching situation. In P. Bourdieu, J.-C. Passeron, & M. de Saint Martin (Eds.), *Academic discourse: Linguistic misunderstanding and professorial power*. Cambridge: Polity Press pp. 1-34
- Cummins, J. (2016). Reflections on Cummins (1980), "The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue" *TESOL Quarterly* 50(4), 940-944
- Dimitriou, K.K., Omurzakova, D., & Narymbetova, K. (2020) L1 literacy in Kazakhstan and its effect on L2 English academic literacy *Proceedings of the 9th ICBCB conference*, Suleyman Demirel University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
- Duff, P.A. (2012). Second language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 564-586). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Duff, P.A., & Anderson, T. (2015) Academic language and literacy socialization for second language students in Numa Markee (Ed.) *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* New York: John Wiley & Sons pp. 337-352
- Field, J., & Burton, J. (2012) Oral reflective journals in Roger Barnard & Anne Burns (eds.) *Researching language teacher cognition and practice* Toronto: Multilingual Matters pp.162-179
- Friedman, D.A. (2019). Citation as a social practice in a TESOL graduate program: A language socialization approach. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 44, 23-36
- Goodman, B.A., & Montgomery, D.P. (2020) "Now I always try to stick to the point": Socialization to and from genre knowledge in an English-medium university in Kazakhstan. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 48
- Keck, C. (2014). Copying, paraphrasing, and academic writing development: A re-examination of L1 and L2 summarization practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 25, 4-22
- Neff-van Aertselaer, J. (2013) Contextualizing EFL argumentation writing practices within the Common European Framework descriptors. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 22, 198-209
- Timm, A. (2008). *Final report on educational practices in Greece*. Retrieved from www.sdaw.info Retrieved on 1 May, 2020
- Yakhontova, T. (2001). Textbooks, contexts, and learners. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 397-415
- Yassukova, L.A. (2020). Izmenenie struktury intellekta podrostkov s 1990 po 2020 gody (Changes in the intellectual structure of teenagers between 1990 and 2020). Lecture *Saint Petersburg psychological summit. St. Petersburg*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hLMdsp3xaA>, Retrieved on 12 August, 2020

Konstantinos K. Dimitriou

KIMEP University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Konstantinos (PhD University of Bath) is an Assistant Professor of the College of Humanities & Education at KIMEP University, originally from Canada. His interests are in Academic Literacies, online literacy, gamification, Corpus Linguistics and collaborative writing.

Karina Narymbetova

KIMEP University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Karina Narymbetova is an Assistant Professor of the College of Humanities & Education at KIMEP University. Her interests are in Applied Linguistics and Education Policy.

Darina Omurzakova

KIMEP University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Darina Omurzakova is a Literacy Lecturer at KIMEP University and an MA TEFL graduate. Darina Omurzakova has been teaching English to adults and young adults and at the tertiary level for almost twenty years. She has been teaching Foundation courses for the last few years and finds her work challenging but extremely rewarding. Teaching critical thinking is a particular area of interest. She holds Master's degree in TESOL and is currently pursuing a doctorate.

Citation practices in L2 learner academic discourse: Form, function and stance of citations in Czech university students master's theses

Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova

Citation practices, which are shaped by the disciplinary and cultural conventions in which academic authors are socialised, are an essential feature of the interpersonal dimension of academic writing that academic writers need to master. In order to build a persuasive argument, academic writers need to use an appropriate range of citation functions and take a stance towards cited sources. However, course-books pay little attention to the rhetorical potential of citations and students tend to use a restricted range of citations and a non-committal stance (cf. Petrić 2007). Aiming to contribute to a better understanding of citation use, this contribution reports the results of a corpus-based analysis of the citation practices of L2 graduate students. The data consist of a learner corpus comprising 48 English-medium Master's degree theses written by Czech university students representing the following disciplines: linguistics, literature, and ELT methodology. The study draws on Swales's (1990) and Hyland's (1999) categorisation of citation forms, Petrić's (2007), Lin, Chen & Chang's (2013) and Dontcheva-Navratilova's (2016) typologies of the rhetorical function of citations and Martin and Whites' (2005) and Coffin's (2009) approach to writer's stance. The aims of the study are (i) to identify citation forms preferred by students, (ii) to study the rhetorical functions citations perform and (ii) to consider what kind of stance students express towards cited sources. The findings suggest that students use a limited range of reporting structures and tend to employ mainly the basic function of citations, i.e. to attribute a proposition to another author. In terms of stance, students rarely adopt dialogically contractive stance (endorse and contest) and prefer to take a neutral stance (acknowledge and distance). The findings of this investigation are intended to inform the design of courses and study materials for the teaching of academic writing at university level, especially to L2 students.

References

- Coffin, C. (2009). Incorporating and evaluating voices in a film studies thesis. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 1, 163-193.
- Dontcheva-Navrátilová, O. (2016). Rhetorical functions of citations in linguistics research articles: A contrastive (English-Czech) study. *Discourse and Interaction*, 9(2), 51-74.
- Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(3), 341-367.
- Lin, C., Chen, Y., & Chang, C. (2013). Citation functions in social sciences and humanities. *ASIST 2013*, 50(1), 1-5.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation. Appraisal in English*. Palgrave.
- Petrić, B. (2007). Rhetorical function of citations in high-and low-rated master's theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 6, 238-253
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova

Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova is Associate Professor of English Linguistics at the Faculty of Education, Masaryk University, Czech Republic. Her research interests include English for academic and specific purposes and political discourse. She has published the books *Analysing Genre: The Colony Text of UNESCO Resolutions* (2009) and *Coherence in Political Speeches* (2011) and co-authored *Persuasion in Specialised Discourse* (2020).

How do writing teachers learn to teach writing?

Claudia Ioana Doroholschi, Ana Cristina Băniceru

While teacher training in the field of writing has been researched in places like the US (e.g. Hirvela and Belcher, 2007), there are many contexts in which much less is known about how teachers acquire their expertise in helping their students develop as writers. This is particularly true of Romanian universities, where, like in other countries in the region (Reichelt, 2005; Tarnopolsky, 2000), there is no long tradition of explicit writing instruction, and few teachers specialize exclusively in teaching writing, although there is increasing demand for writing training at university level both for students and for researchers.

Our paper analyses data from pre-service teacher training curricula, as well as from a qualitative questionnaire and follow-up interviews with faculty members at the Faculty of Letters, History and Theology of the West University of Timișoara, to look at how writing teachers learn to teach writing, what sources of learning and professional development are available to them, and to what extent they see themselves as writing teachers. Our findings show that many of our respondents teach various aspects of writing to students as part of bachelor thesis supervision, while setting writing assignments in various disciplines or while training foreign language students for standardized language tests, and also, increasingly, within dedicated academic writing and research methods courses. Occasional training opportunities for writing teachers include study abroad, workshops for teachers who prepare their students for language tests and international projects. However, in most cases, teachers receive no formal training for teaching writing, and learn it intuitively as part of their research and teaching practice. In discussing the implication of these findings, we aim to highlight what is valuable and what is missing in writing teachers' training and suggest possible directions for writing teacher development in similar contexts.

References

- Hirvela, A., & Belcher, D. (2007). Writing scholars as teacher educators: Exploring writing teacher education. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 125–128.
- Reichelt, M. (2005). English-language writing instruction in Poland. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(4), 215–232
- Tarnopolsky, O. (2000). Writing English as a Foreign Language: A Report from Ukraine. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 209–226.

Claudia Ioana Doroholschi

West University of Timișoara, Timișoara, Romania

Claudia Ioana Doroholschi is a lecturer at the West University of Timișoara, where she teaches literature and academic writing. She is coordinator of the Centre for Academic and Professional Writing at the Faculty of Letters, West University of Timișoara, and has been involved in research regarding writing practices and the teaching of writing in Romania. She is a co-editor of *University writing in Central and Eastern Europe: tradition, transition, and innovation* (2018) and has been involved in a number of projects that focused on writing at University level.

Ana Cristina Băniceru

West University of Timișoara, Timișoara, Romania

Ana Cristina Băniceru is a Lecturer Ph.D. at the West University of Timișoara, Romania where she teaches American Literature, British Modernism and Academic Writing. Her broader research interests cover Narratology, American Literature and Academic Writing. She is the co-author of "Academic writing in Romania: A contrastive analysis of BA thesis introductions in Romanian and English" and "Perceptions about 'good writing' and 'writing competences' in Romanian academic writing practices: a questionnaire study". She was also part of an international SCOPES project: Literacy Development in the Humanities: Creating Competence Centers for the Enhancement of Reading and Writing as part of University Teaching.

English for architecture and construction engineering: Comparing Czech and Italian students' writing needs

Maria Freddi, Jolana Tlukova

The proposed paper presents work done in the broader framework of an EU-funded research project – Becoming A Digital Global Engineer, BADGE (<https://www.the-badgeproject.eu>), aimed at designing teaching/learning material for engineering students' language and communication skills. In this context, a survey has been jointly designed by the two authors to develop a profile of the writing needs of engineering students at their respective institutions, Brno University of Technology in the Czech Republic and Pavia University in Italy (following, for example, Gollin-Kies et al. 2015, Liu et al. 2011 and the GELS Framework as found in Rinder et al. 2020). The paper compares the results of the survey with two conference questions in mind, namely “What do we need to know directly to support academic writers at any level?”, and “How do technologies help writing development pedagogy?”. Preliminary results point to discrepancies between students' perceptions and teachers' expectations concerning genre writing in the engineering fields and to a wide range of writing needs that call for tailored tuition. Responses to the survey items are discussed that assess the impact of technology on writing tuition as a consequence of the pandemic crisis. Examples include use of chat and other digital tools during language classes. The results are analysed as an opportunity to reflect on and compare the individual teaching practices that the two co-authors have implemented as teachers of English in Civil Engineering and Architecture and Construction Engineering degree programmes, as well as to develop materials that meet the students' needs, both specific to the individual contexts and cutting across them.

References

- Gollin-Kies, S., Hall, D. R., Moore, S. H. (2015). *Language for Specific Purposes*. London: Palgrave.
- Liu, J., Chang, Y., Yang, F., & Sun, Y. (2011). “Is what I need what I want?” Reconceptualising college students' needs in English courses for general and specific/academic purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10 (4), 271–280.
- Rinder, J., Richter, T., Sweeney Geslin, T., & Tual, D. (2020). The Global Engineers Language Skills (GELS) Network: An Update. In Malmqvist, J., Bennedsen, J., Edström, K., Kuptasthien, N., Roslöf, A. S. J., Saemundsdottir, I., Siiskonen, M. (Eds.) *Proceedings of The 16th International CDIO Conference – Full Papers*, vol. 1, Chalmers University of Technology.

Maria Freddi

University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy

I am Associate professor of English language and linguistics at the University of Pavia, Italy, where I teach courses in Text Analysis and Corpus Methodology to students majoring in languages and linguistics as well as EAP courses, especially Academic Writing, to architectural engineering students and students of Archaeology and Art. I have recently co-edited a special issue on Specialised Discourse for the journal *Discourse & Interaction*, and am participating in the EU-funded Becoming a Digital Global Engineer (BADGE) project, focusing on language education for engineering students.

Jolana Tlukova

Brno University of Technology, Brno, Czech Republic

I am Assistant professor of English at Brno University of Technology where I teach courses on Professional and Academic English and English in the Architectural Profession. My recent publications in the area of English for Academic and Professional Purposes include “Teaching Technical Vocabulary at Universities: Which, How and When?” for the *CASALC Review*, vol. 2019, no. 1, 38–45. ISSN: 1804-9435.

Writing and thinking: What changes with digitalization?

Curtis Gautschi, Otto Kruse, Christian Rapp

In this contribution, we draw on methodology from key logging and writing analytics to offer a fresh look at formulation processes. Key logging captures the inscription processes of writers and by analysing and visualizing them, we can draw inferences on decision making strategies during formulation. At the current stage of our work, we are experimenting with qualitative and quantitative evaluation methodologies. Many of our insights concern formulation patterns that seem typical for digital writing and which make it necessary break new theoretical ground relating formulation to technology use and thinking.

Our access point to writing processes is the analysis of texts written within Thesis Writer, a tool that allows writing processes to be tracked visually through a time slider, and to be analysed incrementally and statistically. We follow a writing analytics approach that draws on ongoing writing projects stretching across several months rather than artificial writing assignments for research purposes. We selected nine bachelor theses for analysis. Approximately 2,500 logging data events per text with timestamps and incremental text versions were gathered, processed and analysed in an R environment.

We present time slider visualizations of text development and provide qualitative and quantitative evidence demonstrating that thinking and writing in digital contexts connect differently than previously assumed. Our data also demonstrates that writers use far more words than remain in final texts. Revision appears to outweigh planning and idea development as writers are caught in continuous re-writing and rearrangement cycles. We see a tendency away from linear writing to patchwork writing, where chunks of words are placed on screen and rearranged until idea development stops. Text progress also appears connected to growing lexical density, showing that new words needed to develop a text are added in successive revision cycles, and that idea development necessarily connects to this lexical enrichment.

Curtis Gautschi

Zürich University of Applied Sciences, Winthertthur, Switzerland

Curtis is a research associate in the field of applied linguistics. His particular research interests are in the assessment of foreign language speaking and writing, the criteria used in such assessment and the validation support for their use. He also specializes in language test design, data processing and analysis for testing purposes and rating scale development.

Otto Kruse

Zürich University of Applied Sciences, Winthertthur, Switzerland

Otto Kruse is a retired professor at the Zurich University of Applied Sciences. He specializes in the teaching and research of academic writing. He was and is involved in several international research projects exploring writing in European higher education and currently is focusing on digital writing, and developing Thesis Writer, a tool supporting dissertation writers.

Christian Rapp

Zürich University of Applied Sciences, Winthertthur, Switzerland

Christian Rapp is the Head of Educational Technology at the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning, School of Management and Law, Zürich University of Applied Sciences. He is a Co-founder and developer of Thesis Writer (www.thesis-writer.eu).

Knowing our students, knowing ourselves: How the backgrounds and challenges of multilingual writers in an international programme can inform our group mentorship and feedback processes

Lindsey Gruber

Nordic higher education has continued to be an attractive option for international students because of its English medium of instruction programmes (Wächter & Maiworm, 2014). However, the Danish education system, which gives a great deal of autonomy to students for their own learning (Martin-Rubió & Cots, 2018), is likely an adjustment for many international students as they encounter new expectations, such as writing projects collaboratively in groups. This presentation will report on a portion of findings from a broader study currently in progress at a Danish university programme where writing support is primarily enacted through a mentoring model between supervisors and project groups. This presentation explores the question “what else do we need to know to teach academic writers so that they can prosper?” The data derives from a mixed-methods approach (Creswell, 2014), entailing a questionnaire distributed to a first year cohort in an international humanities bachelor programme, a real-time student writing log collected via WhatsApp (Kaufmann & Peil, 2019), and a stimulated recall interview focused on the participant’s final written project (Beiler, 2019; Ene, McIntosh, & Connor, 2019). An overview of findings focus on drawing lines of connection among students’ perspectives. The presentation will detail 1) their writing backgrounds prior to entering a Danish university programme, 2) their group writing practices in Denmark, 3) their writing challenges, and 4) their support needs when writing collaboratively in English. The research findings, I argue, open areas for writing teachers and subject supervisors to better understand how students experience collaborative writing and supervision in English, thus providing a path forward to incorporate targeted support for multilingual students in international programmes.

References

- Beiler, I. R. (2019). Negotiating multilingual resources in English writing instruction for recent immigrants to Norway. *TESOL Quarterly*, 54(1), 5-29.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Ene, E., McIntosh, K., & Connor, U. (2019). Using intercultural rhetoric to examine translingual practices of postgraduate L2 writers of English. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 45, 100664.
- Kaufmann, K., & Peil, C. (2020). The mobile instant messaging interview (MIMI): Using WhatsApp to enhance self-reporting and explore media usage in situ. *Mobile Media & Communication*, 8(2), 229-246.
- Martin-Rubió, X., & Cots, J. M. (2018). Self-confidence amongst study abroad students in an ‘English as a lingua franca’ university. *Language Awareness*, 27(1-2), 96-112.
- Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (Eds.). (2014). *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The state of play in 2014*. Bonn: Lemmens. https://www.lemmens.de/dateien/medien/buecher-eb-books/aca/2014_english_taught.pdf

Lindsey Gruber

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

Lindsey Gruber is a doctoral student at Universidad Autónoma de Madrid where she studies the experiences of multilingual writers completing university assignments in English. Since earning her MA TESOL, Lindsey has taught first year writing, EAP, and ESP at universities in the United States, Hong Kong, and New Zealand. She also works independently in curriculum development, institutional research, and academic editing.

The effect of teacher written feedback on student use of source materials

Alma Jahić Jašić

Although student use of source materials and teacher written feedback (TWF) are two topics that have drawn much attention and have, consequently, generated a lot of research (see, for instance, Childers & Burton, 2016; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014; Shi, 2008; for the former, and Ferris, 2003a, 2003b, 2004; Hyland F., 1998, 2000, 2001, 2003; Hyland K. & Hyland F., 2006; Junqueira, & Payant, 2015; Truscott & Yi-ping Hsu, 2008, for the latter), studies specifically focusing on how TWF affects student use of sources seem to be lacking. Therefore, this study (which is a part of a larger research project) reports on whether TWF is beneficial for students' improvement of appropriate use of sources with the aim to contribute to the existing pool of knowledge on response to student writing. The study looked at 124 texts, i.e. 62 pairs of first and revised drafts written by 45 students. The analysis of student drafts was influenced by F. Hyland's (1998) study as her approach to data was found to be suitable for the current study. Besides student drafts, a number of other materials was used to investigate the topic in question such as reflection question forms, classroom observation, teacher forms, etc. which allowed for the triangulation of data and enabled obtaining a bigger picture of the effect TWF has on student use of source materials. However, the focus here will be only on the results of the first and revised student drafts. The results showed that 62 first drafts generated 257 feedback points out of which 175 were considered as usable, i.e. able to incite revision, and 82 as non-usable. The 175 usable feedback points generated 120 (69%) successful and 28 (16%) partially successful revisions which clearly demonstrates that most of students' revised drafts were improved with the guidance of TWF. Thus, TWF appears to have a good potential for helping students improve their skills of working with source materials as they seem to be open to advice dispensed through it.

References:

- Childers, D., & Burton, S. (2016). "Should It Be Considered Plagiarism?" Student Perceptions of Complex Citation Issues. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 14(1), 1 – 17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-015-9250-6>
- Ferris, D. (2003a). Responding to writing. In B. Kroll, (Ed.), *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing* (pp. 119 – 140). Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. (2003b). *Response to student writing: Implications for second-language students*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D. R. (2004). The "Grammar Correction" Debate in L2 Writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime ...?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 49 – 62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.005>
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 255 – 286.
- Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(1), 33 – 54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688000400103>
- Hyland, F. (2001). Dealing with plagiarism when giving feedback. *ELT Journal*, 55(4), 375 – 381.
- Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: student engagement with teacher feedback. *System*, 31, 217 – 230. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(03\)00021-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00021-6)
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Interpersonal aspects of response: Constructing and interpreting teacher written feedback. In K. Hyland, & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 206 – 224). Cambridge University Press.
- Junqueira, L., & Payant, C. (2015). "I just want to do it right, but it's so hard": A novice teacher's written feedback beliefs and practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 19 – 36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.11.001>
- Pecorari, D., & Petrić, B. (2014). Plagiarism in Second-language Writing. *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 269 – 302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000056>
- Shi, L. (2008). Textual Appropriation and Citing Behaviors of University Undergraduates. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(1), 1 – 24. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn045>
- Truscott, J., & Yi-ping Hsu, A. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 292 – 305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.05.003>

Alma Jahić Jašić

University of Tuzla, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina
Alma Jahić Jašić is an associate professor at English Studies Department of Tuzla University. Her main research interests include plagiarism, written feedback and writing for publication. She is a member of European Literacy Network (ELN) as well as EATAW. She is interested in developing the field of academic writing in her home country.

Say it in your words!: Student source-use and faculty approaches. Toward a collaborative academic integrity environment

Ilkem Kayican Dipcin

This research aims to examine if the judgments of different stakeholders including lecturers, students, instructors and teaching assistants of a freshman humanities course diversify in their evaluations of breach of academic integrity cases in the written assignments. The instruction of appropriate source-use, citation and paraphrasing are part of this course and academic integrity policies are indicated on the various online platforms of the university, although there is a decrease in plagiarism cases, increasing anxiety among the students is still apparent because of the fear of failing due to plagiarism. This might stem from the fact that the academic integrity policy statements seem to situate themselves not as an educational but ethical evaluation and this affects learning negatively (Pecorari & Petric, 2014). To compare different perceptions, the study will draw on 30 semi-structured interviews with an equal number of participants from each group of stakeholders. Prior to these in-depth interviews, an online survey was sent, and this data will be used to triangulate findings. Participants will be asked to evaluate the same example cases from student texts and their judgments will be asked about the potential breach of academic integrity in these papers (Pecorari & Shaw, 2012). Through the findings, the study aims to explore if the existing approaches are successful in offering equal treatment toward different academic dishonesty cases and use this information to revise the existing academic integrity procedures to be more pedagogical. The data analysis will be finalized in 2 months period, preliminary findings seem promising in terms of introducing a discussion about the educational and pedagogical contributions of the current evaluation methods of plagiarism. In the middle of rapid transformation of digitization of education, this research aims to provoke new ideas about revising academic writing instructors' roles in terms of evaluation of academic integrity behaviours of the learners.

References:

- Pecorari, D., & Petrić, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing. *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 269–302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444814000056>
- Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2012). Types of student intertextuality and faculty attitudes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 149–164.

Ilkem Kayican Dipcin

Sabanci University, Istanbul, Turkey

Ilkem Kayican Dipcin is an EAP instructor and the coordinator for a freshman course "Society & Humanity" in Sabanci University. She is also one of the trainers and supervisors of Peer Writing Fellows Program in Sabanci University which is a support unit recruiting undergraduate students to act as tutors for the development of academic writing of other undergraduate students. She has been teaching academic skills to variety levels of EFL students for 15 years and conducting research on second language writing since 2012. Her paper presentations and publications include topics in intercultural rhetoric, effective feedback in academic writing and academic integrity.

Academic writing in the native tongue: Developing the discipline through rhetoric and composition

Irina Korotkina

In countries where academic writing has not been taught until rather recently, the interest in its methodology was triggered by the institutional pressure on academics to ‘publish or perish’ (Lillis & Curry, 2015; Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2014). Solutions to the problem have been sought through English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP) aimed at developing metadiscursive skills and enhancing better communication between multilingual scholars and anglophone editors and reviewers (Concoran & Englander, 2016; Flowerdew & Li, 2020; Hyland, 2020). However, ERPP can only partially be effective in countries like Russia, where the level of English among researchers is generally poor (Lovakov & Yudkevich, 2020; Zemliansky & Goroshko, 2016). A decade-long comparative study conducted in Russian universities (Korotkina, 2018; 2021) demonstrates that metadiscursive skills are transferable and could therefore be effectively developed in and through the native tongue, which significantly increases the audience and minimizes the time of learning. The approach draws from the models of rhetoric and composition (Lynn, 2010; Enos, 2010), merging anglophone methodology with the content in the national language by focusing on the cognitive stages of rhetoric, which helps learners overcome the national tradition of obscure writing, such as lack of focus, poor organization, excessive nominalization, or wordiness. The approach has been approbated in a number of leading Russian universities through seminars, workshops, schools, and certified professional development courses. Recently, an on-line course for academics, editors, and researchers has been designed and successfully approbated. The methodology was defended in the author’s dissertation (Doctor of Science), which established the basis for introducing academic writing in Russian into the national system of education. This may contribute to the quality of not only international but also national publications. The approach may also be effective in post-Soviet spaces where Russian is still the lingua franca of academic communication.

References

- Corcoran, J. N., & Englander, K. (2016). A proposal for critical-pragmatic pedagogical approaches to English for research publication purposes. *Publications*, 4(1), 6.
- Enos, T. (Ed.) (2010). *Encyclopedia of rhetoric and composition: Communication from ancient times to the information age*. Routledge.
- Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2020). Teaching English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP): A review of language teachers’ pedagogical initiatives. *English for Specific Purposes*, 59, 29–41.
- Hyland, K. (2020). Peer review: Objective screening or wishful thinking? *Journal of English for Research and Publication Purposes*, 1(1), 51–65.
- Korotkina, I. (2018). *Modeli obucheniya akademicheskomu pis'mu: mezhdunarodny opyt i otechestvennaya praktika [Academic writing teaching models: international experience and national practices]*. Urait Publishing House.
- Korotkina, I. (2021). Academic Writing in Russia Beyond Zero Point. In A.L. Squires & M. Overstreet (Eds.), *Emerging Writing Research from the Russian Federation*. WAC Clearinghouse. University Press of Colorado, USA. (In print).
- Kuteeva, M., & Mauranen, A. (2014). Writing for publication in multilingual contexts: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 13, 1–4.
- Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2015). The politics of English, language and uptake. *AILA Review*, 28, 127–150.
- Lovakov, A., & Yudkevich, M. M. (2021). The post-Soviet publication landscape for higher education research. *Higher Education*, 81(2), 273–299.
- Lynn, S. (2010). *Rhetoric and composition: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zemliansky, P., & Goroshko, O. (2016). A survey of academic and professional writing in higher education in Russia and Ukraine. In P. Zemliansky & K. St. Amant (Eds.), *Rethinking post-communist rhetoric: Perspectives on rhetoric, writing, and professional communication in post-Soviet spaces* (pp. 3–18). Lexington Books.

Irina Korotkina

Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Moscow, Russia
Irina Korotkina is Director of Academic Writing and Communication Center at the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration and Dean of the Department of English at the Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences, Moscow, Russia. She holds two Russian doctoral degrees in education (2008 and 2018), both dissertations being devoted to developing academic writing in Russia. She has taught academic writing for 23 years in English and 13 years in Russian, published over 80 research papers and 11 books, and designed an online course of writing for research publication purposes.

The art of the possible: From generic to embedded academic literacy development

Bente Kristiansen, Stacey M. Cozart

Research into academic literacies and genre approaches to writing instruction points to the importance of embedding academic writing instruction in the curriculum to enhance all students' disciplinary writing and learning (Wingate 2019). Based on this research, a writing support initiative run by the authors at Aarhus University in Denmark has recently shifted its focus from student-facing extracurricular writing support to collaboration with content lecturers to embed students' literacy development in undergraduate and graduate curricula. This shift has resulted in fruitful partnerships, but also revealed obstacles to fully embedding literacy development in the curriculum. This paper investigates our work with content lecturers to identify factors that hinder or contribute to embedding academic writing instruction in the curriculum.

We present the preliminary findings from a qualitative pilot study based on three cases, including interviews with content lecturers, classroom observations, and document analysis. We inquire into the ways in which we navigate and reconcile our respective professional imperatives and boundaries, as well as into our conceptions of language and writing, and discuss the influence of the wider context of higher education in Denmark. Finally, we compare our findings with other studies on collaboration and curriculum integration (e.g. Purser 2011; Wingate 2015). The content lecturers seem to acknowledge the close connection between writing development and disciplinary learning and content, and thus support the new efforts to integrate writing (and other academic literacy practices) into the curriculum. However, the cases also reveal a number of obstacles to change, including cultural, structural, and organizational roadblocks.

References

- Purser, E. (2011). Developing academic literacy in context: Trends in Australia. In: M. Deane and P. O'Neill (eds) *Writing in the Disciplines* (pp. 30-43). London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Wingate, U. (2015). Academic Literacy and Student Diversity. The Case for Inclusive Practice. *New Perspectives on language and education*: 42. Multilingual Matters
- Wingate, U. (2019). Achieving transformation through collaboration: the role of academic literacies. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, (15). Retrieved from <https://journal.aladinhe.ac.uk/index.php/jldhe/article/view/566>

Bente Kristiansen

Centre for Educational Development, Aarhus University, Copenhagen, Denmark

Bente Kristiansen, Ph.D., is a senior educational consultant at the Centre for Educational Development at Aarhus University. She has several years of experience both as a content teacher in communication and as a writing consultant in a writing center. For the last 15 years, she has worked as an educational consultant with a special interest support students' academic literacies, and how to embed this support in subject teaching. She has conducted development work and run workshops in both high school and university about developing students' academic writing competences.

Stacey M. Cozart

Centre for Educational Development, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

Stacey M. Cozart is a senior educational consultant at the Centre for Educational Development at Aarhus University. She is interested in supporting best practice for internationalizing the higher education curriculum, with particular focus on inclusive teaching practices and developing students' academic literacy. Over the past decade, she has done research and development work and run courses and workshops on these issues, including best practice for teaching and learning in multilingual and multicultural settings, developing students' academic literacy in the disciplines, and doctoral courses on research communication skills in English.

Differentiating formats: What do we call what we are doing and what does that mean?

Eva Kuntschner

Clicking through individuals' and universities' websites in "the writing community" one can find many different names for the products they offer: writing training, writing workshops, writing counseling, writing coaching, writing teaching ... The differences and/or similarities between these formats remain often unclear, which in turn is cause for confusion among potential clients and service providers alike.

This presentation is based on an article which was published in German in "Coaching – Theorie und Praxis" in December 2020 (DOI 10.1365/s40896-020-00049-7) and which discusses the various formats we work in and attempts to define and differentiate them in more detail. The results of this theory-based article could also be interesting for the English-speaking writing (teaching) community, as it addresses questions central to our work: Who is our target audience? Do we work in one-on-one or group settings? What is the difference between counselling and coaching? etc. The aim of the presentation is to shed some light on the different formats we work in and the implications they bring with them in order to contribute to removing uncertainties in and to provide service providers in the wide field of "writing teaching" with a surer footing in the description of the products they offer.

References

- Busse, S., & Tietel, E. (2018). *Mit dem Dritten sieht man besser: Triaden und Triangulierung in der Beratung*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1968). *Homo Sociologicus. Ein Versuch zur Geschichte, Bedeutung und Kritik der Kategorie der sozialen Rolle* (7th edition). Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Döring, K. (2017). *Wie kann man Schreibberatung definieren und wie lässt sie sich in der Beratungsspsychologie verorten?* <https://openblog.hypotheses.org/199>.
- Grieshammer, E., Liebetanz, F., Peters, N., & Zegenhagen, J. (2013). *Zukunftsmodell Schreibberatung. Eine Anleitung zur Begleitung von Schreibenden im Studium*. Schneider Hohengehren.
- Kallmeyer, W. (2000). Beraten und Betreuen: Zur gesprächsanalytischen Untersuchung von helfenden Interaktionen. *Zeitschrift für qualitative Bildungs-, Beratungs- und Sozialforschung*, 1, 227–252. URN: <http://nbnresolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-280593>.
- Kern, S., & Stadler, C. (2010). *Psychodrama. Eine Einführung*. Springer VS.
- Nestmann, F. (2007). Beratung zwischen alltäglicher Hilfe und Profession. In Nestmann, F. (ed.). *Das Handbuch der Beratung 1: Disziplinen und Zugänge*. 547–558. DGVT-Verlag.
- Wimmer, A., Wimmer, J., Buchacher, W., & Kamp, G. (2012). *Das Beratungsgespräch: Skills und Tools für die Fachberatung*. Linde.
- Nestmann, F. (ed.). (2007b). *Disziplinen und Zugänge. Das Handbuch der Beratung, Bd. 1*. DGVT-Verlag.
- Schreyögg, A. (2012). Besonderheiten des Coaching – Unterschiede zur Supervision. In H. Pühl (ed.), *Grundlagen – Praxis – Perspektiven. Handbuch der Supervision*, (Bd. 3), 196–208. Ulrich Leutner.
- Thierau-Brunner, H., Stelzer-Rothe, T. (2018). Coaching hat viele lebendige Facetten. In: Stelzer-Rothe, T., Thierau-Brunner, H. (eds.). *Einblicke in systemisches Coaching. Theorie, Praxisfälle, Erfahrungen*. Wissenschafts-Verlag.

Eva Kuntschner

University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Eva Kuntschner holds a degree in English and American Studies from the University of Graz, Austria, and a degree in Supervision and Coaching from the University of Vienna, Austria. She is a trained writing teacher and has been teaching on university level since 2003.

At the University of Vienna she is the coordinator of the university-wide "Writing Mentoring"-programme, where she is in charge of training and supervising writing peer tutors.

She also works as an academic writing teacher and as supervisor and coach.

Her current research interests revolve around the professional development of writing teachers and around writing teaching as university care work.

Academic writing in second language: Issues and choices. A case study of Romance languages academic writing in Estonian context

Aleksandra Ljalikova, Kristina Rebane

Writing an academic paper is cognitively and linguistically demanding even for a native speaker and experienced scholar. The challenge for a bachelor student who is novice in research and who has to write his or her first paper in a second or foreign language (SL) becomes tremendous (Tran 2013).

This study aims to map main issues in teaching and learning academic writing of third-year students in the bachelor program of romance languages: French and Italian SL. Students come from the same institutional context, Department of Humanities of Tallinn University, and most of them have reached B1 language level at the beginning of the academic writing course. The study will focus on the design of the course “Academic writing” given by two different educators, in two different romance languages by aiming at the same target: an academic article in a target second language Italian or French. The main research question is:

How can the course design be changed in order to better support students’ academic writing in Italian or French languages (SL) in Estonian context?

- What difficulties do SL students (10) have in this course? How students see the development of the course design?
- What difficulties do SL educators (2) meet in this course? How educators see the development of the course design?

The study is based on the theoretical framework of developmental evaluation (Patton 2010) and the theory of action (Engeström 2015).

The paper reports that difficulties are met at three levels: micro (course design), meso (curriculum design) and macro (different academic linguistic communities). The study uses the triangulation of data (interviews with students, measurement of students’ understanding of academic writing, educators’ self-reflection, the analysis of objectives and outcomes of the course). The number of students is modest (10), but a qualitative approach helps to study this question in depth. The results show what can be done at the micro level (course design) e.g. a more structured scaffolding system is needed to be developed, and at the meso level (curriculum design) e.g. academic writing skills and students’ research projects should be integrated earlier. The discussion is very controversial at the macro level (linguistic academic community) (Charles et al. 2009; Lee & Canagarajah 2019).

References

- Charles, M., Hunston, S., & Pecorari, D. (Eds.). (2009). *Academic writing: At the interface of corpus and discourse*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Engeström, Y. (2015). *Learning by expanding*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, E., & Canagarajah, S. (2019). The connection between transcultural dispositions and translingual practices in academic writing. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 14(1), 14–28.
- Patton, M. Q. (2010). *Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. Guilford press.
- Tran, L. T. (2013). *International student adaptation to academic writing in higher education*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Aleksandra Ljalikova

Tallinn University, Tallinn, Estonia

Aleksandra Ljalikova is an Associate professor in Foreign Language Education. Her research projects are related to the use of technology in foreign language education as well as content and foreign language integrated learning (CLIL).

Kristina Rebane

Tallinn University, Tallinn, Estonia

Kristina Rebane is an Associate professor in Italian Studies. Her research has focused on the narrative techniques in Italian literature in the 19th and 20th century and on the issues of subjectivity in contemporary Italian literature.

No writing courses? No problem: Determining students' writing needs through writing center sessions

Warren Merkel

Although first-year writing courses are becoming more common at European universities, they are not always implemented university-wide (Kruse, 2013). Consequently, university writing centers are often positioned as de facto writing programs (Santa, 2009). Given this scenario, this session explores the conference themes of what educators should know to support student writers, and where writing support might reside.

In spring 2020 and autumn 2020, I held several writing center sessions with first-year students at a newly-established writing center in the Department of Education at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU). During these sessions, I assisted students with English-medium writing tasks. I also kept journal records of the writing challenges students faced. These records tracked two data sources – one, my feedback provided on students' writing, and two, verbal concerns expressed directly by students. Data analysis was conducted via open, axial, and selective coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2007).

Three themes emerged regarding students' concerns with academic writing. First, instructors must determine students' pre-existing knowledge regarding academic writing that is formed prior to entering university. This knowledge can help inform instructors' classroom practices. Second, instructors must track students' concerns in real-time as they take university courses. In this study specifically, the most prevalent themes were students' struggles to establish their "voice" in academic writing; to develop clear topic sentences and coherent paragraphs; and to fuse the agenda or narrative of their writing with extant research. Third, instructors must determine what they can do to continue to accommodate students' writing needs.

This session will close with a discussion of what universities (both in and outside of Europe) do or can do to address the challenges of students' transition between high school and university academic writing.

References

- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2007). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed). Sage Publications.
- Kruse, O. (2013). Perspectives on Academic Writing in European Higher Education: genres, practices and competences. *REDU: Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 11(1), 37-58.
- Santa, T. (2009). Writing center tutor training: What is transferable across academic cultures. *Zeitschrift Schreiben*, 22(7), 1-6.

Warren Merkel

The Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Department of Teacher Education (Institutt for lærerutdanning), Trondheim, Norway

Warren Merkel is an Associate Professor in the Department of Education (Institutt for lærerutdanning) at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Trondheim, Norway. He has also taught in the US, South Korea, and Japan. He received his PhD in Foreign Language and ESL Education from the University of Iowa, USA. His teaching and research interests include second language writing, plagiarism, dialogic interactions and writing feedback, and multicultural education.

Agency as a jointly constructed action: An ethnographic study of developing a writing training program at a German university

Tetyana Müller-Lyaskovets, Meni Syrou, Olena Horner

This study is necessitated by the current state of teaching English writing that German universities do not consign to English or Rhetoric departments. Moreover, writing is not embedded across the mainstream curriculum. This decentralized delivery of teaching writing presents both methodological and administrative challenges. Which units have motivation and expertise to facilitate English writing instruction across the curriculum at German universities?

Our autoethnography explores the initiatives that resulted in the establishment of a sustained writing training program in English at a German university. The overall aim of the study was to examine effective practices in the launch and initial phase of the project.

The study utilizes ethnographic research to analyze professional experience of the authors who participated as both instructors, administrators, and researchers in the launch and implementation of the project. Taking a form of a “layered account” (Ellis et al., 2011; Roth, 2005), the study positions the authors’ experiences alongside document analysis, self-reflection, and a literature review. Because teacher agency is situated in a socio-cultural context (Kayi-Aydar et.al, 2019), the authors first analyze public documents to support their reflections. Second, the authors offer their personal narratives about how they used educational action research (EAR) (Edwards & Burns, 2016) to initiate change.

The analysis shows that English writing instruction is marginally institutionalized at German universities. The autoethnographic narratives detail both personal, structural, and cultural challenges to implementing an innovative writing program. Entering into a dialogue with other departments and faculty turned to be a crucial success strategy. The narratives demonstrate the value of EAR that allowed for adapting a plan of action to the local context.

The study makes a case for agency as an action co-constructed through a dialogue with teachers, administration, and students. The study also offers solutions for writing development at German and other European universities.

References

- Edwards, E., & Burns, A. (2016). Language teacher action research: Achieving sustainability. *ELT Journal*, 70(1), 6-15. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv060>
- Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2010). Autoethnography: An overview. *Forum: Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1), Art. 10, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1101108>
- Roth, W. (2005). *Auto/biography and auto/ethnography: Praxis of research method*. Sense.
- Kayi-Aydar, H., Gao, X., Miller, E. R., Varghese, M., & Vitanova, G. (Eds.). (2019). *Theorizing and analyzing language teacher agency*. Multilingual Matters.

Tetyana Müller-Lyaskovets

Technische Universität Dortmund, Dortmund, Germany

Tetyana Müller-Lyaskovets teaches writing and supervises writing instruction and counseling (English) at the Department of Foreign Languages, Technische Universität Dortmund. Tetyana completed her Ph.D. at Purdue University, USA. Her current research interests lie in the areas of learner and teacher autonomy, assessment of writing, and course portfolios.

Meni Syrou

Technische Universität Dortmund, Dortmund, Germany

Meni Syrou has been the Head of the Department of Foreign Languages, Technische Universität Dortmund since 2007. She teaches courses in German as a Foreign Language at the B2 and C1 levels. In her courses, Meni puts a strong focus on portfolio writing and assessment.

At the institutional level, Meni is very interested in the promotion of offers on academic and professional writing for both German and English. Currently, she is working on the implementation of an academic writing program for German (L1, L2, FL) that spans different faculties and institutes at TU Dortmund University.

Olena Horner

Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Policy Analysis, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, USA

Olena Horner is a researcher in the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Policy Analysis, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, USA.

Olena completed her Ph.D. at the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities. Her areas of research include undergraduate and graduate students’ college experiences, such as satisfaction with instructional quality, advising, institutional support, campus climate, etc., and their impact on students’ retention, graduation, and time to degree.

MySupervisor – a program to aid STEM students in academic writing

Tzipora Rakedzon, Dima Birenbaum, Yaron Honen, Gary Mataev

Both Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) programs and online grammar and style checkers attempt to aid students in improving their writing; previous research has investigated the use of such software (Lim & Phua, 2019; Parra & Calero, 2019) and shown that many of these programs attempt to correct students' work, but do not encourage active learning by the writer (Wu, 2014). Therefore, this project aimed to create a *writing assistance program* to aid STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) students when *correcting their own academic writing* based on an academic writing course. The pilot program, MySupervisor, has a WORD plug-in and a web-based natural language processing (NLP) component. The WORD plug-in marks types of words such as wordy language, nouns and verbs, among other functions; the NLP component is a web-based function that assesses whether individual sentences are wordy or not. Both functions mark the problem, so students can then focus and correct their texts based on course instruction.

To test the program, we conducted a pilot study this academic year (2020-2021) to research if and how L2 STEM graduate students improve their writing using MySupervisor. In the winter semester, one group was introduced to the program features in an academic writing course during the corresponding lessons. Students were then asked to complete exercises with and without the program, so accuracy and timing could be compared. Moreover, a pre and post survey was administered to students about their use of other grammar checkers, their knowledge of academic writing style and grammar, and the effectiveness of MySupervisor. Survey results showed the positive effects on students' writing: they believed their timing would improve in subsequent uses of the program, and they already used the program outside of class and plan to do so in the future.

Our aim is for the program to be used on a wider scale in the university system and to assist students to efficiently improve their own academic texts.

References:

- Lim, F. V., & Phua, J. (2019). Teaching Writing with Language Feedback Technology. *Computers and Composition*, 54, 102518.
- Parra, L., & Calero, X. (2019). Automated Writing Evaluation Tools in the Improvement of the Writing Skill, *International Journal of Instruction*, 2019-Apr. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(2), 209–226.
- Wu, Y. L. (2014). The impact of technology on language learning. *Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering*, 309 LNEE, 727–731.

Tzipora Rakedzon

Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel

Tzipora Rakedzon serves as the coordinator and a lecturer of Graduate Academic Writing at the Technion – Israel Institute of Technology. She has been teaching a variety of writing and communication courses for over 20 years. Tzipora has a PhD in science communication and a BA and MA in linguistics. She is also a lecturer and the coordinator of the English Program at the Guangdong Technion, China. Tzipora's research deals with assessing academic and popular science writing. Specifically, she is involved in the development of automated tools that aid writers in evaluating and improving their writing style, grammar, and vocabulary.

Dima Birenbaum

Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel

Dima Birenbaum graduated with a B.Sc. in Computer Science from the Technion – Israel Institute of Technology. His field of expertise is full-stack and software development. He is a Deep Learning enthusiast, and his primary field of experience is in Computer Vision problems and Convolutional Neural Networks. Dima is also interested in Natural Language Processing (NLP), and he is passionate to make complex things simpler.

Yaron Honen

Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel

Yaron Honen is the Geometric Image Processing Laboratory chief engineer in the Computer Science Department at the Technion. Yaron has 30 years' experience in scientific system development and is a specialist in the system and product development process. Yaron's previous positions include CEO; research and development manager; large scale engineering project manager; software manager; system and software architecture; and software developer. Yaron was responsible for part of the team that developed medical and other equipment at Biosense Webster (a Johnson & Johnson company), Kulicke & Soffa, Cubital (a subsidiary of Scitex (Kodak)), Direx, Spectrum Dynamics, and Harmonic lightwaves.

Gary Mataev

Technion Israel Institute of Technology and Nvidia Corporation, Haifa, Israel

Gary Mataev graduated with an MSc in Computer Science from the Technion– Israel Institute of Technology. During his MSc, he specialized in machine learning and image processing tasks. Moreover, Gary has supervised students' projects in the field of deep learning. Currently, he works at Nvidia Corporation as an AI (artificial intelligence) Software Architect. As part of his job as a Software Architect, Gary designs smart solutions by using AI in the company's products, and he supervises the process from POC (Proof of Concept) to production.

Digital provision for undergraduate proposal writing: Securing conceptual alignment between writer and supervisor when using Thesis Writer

Christian Rapp, Otto Kruse

Several new digital tools (Cotos et al., 2020; Knight et al., 2020; Rapp & Kauf, 2018) are devoted to supporting thesis writers. Whilst doctoral thesis writing is a well-studied issue (Berman & Smyth, 2015; Dysthe et al., 2006; Maxwell & Smyth, 2011; Vehviläinen & Löfström, 2016), much less is known about thesis writing within shorter Continental European 3-year undergraduate programmes. To equally study and support thesis writing, we created Thesis Writer (TW), a bilingual (English/German) genre-sensitive tool that offers dissertation writers a word processor with additional support at the conceptual, rhetorical, structural, and organisational level, as well as collaborative writing and feedback functionality.

The aim of this presentation is to provide both illustrative data and a synthesis of TW's affordances in structuring student/supervisor interaction when setting up the first thesis project. One practical concern of high significance is the reaction of supervisors to the tool, as it is essential that supervisors not only accept the tool and its philosophy, but that they actively integrate it into their supervision practices. Preliminary observations (Rapp et al., 2020) have shown that they are creative in cultivating their own ways of using TW when developing a thesis structure. In a case study of ten students at a Swiss University, we observed writer-supervisor interactions during their initial and first follow-up BA thesis meetings, each lasting 60-90 minutes. The meetings were conducted and recorded virtually, to determine how they came to an agreement about the topic, and how they ensured that they both understood it in the same way. This kind of "conceptual alignment" (Schober, 2005) involves negotiated intentions and expectations on both sides when creating a basic proposal structure supported by TW. In adjacent qualitative interviews, students and supervisors were asked about their experiences with this procedure and about their reactions to TW. The results show a broad range of interaction patterns and considerable divergence in the way TW is used.

References

- Berman, J., & Smyth, R. (2015). Conceptual frameworks in the doctoral research process: A pedagogical model. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 52(2), 125-136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2013.809011>
- Cotos, E., Huffman, S., & Link, S. (2020). Understanding graduate writers' interaction with and impact of the Research Writing Tutor during revision. *Journal of Writing Research*, 12(1), 187-232. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2020.12.01.07>
- Dysthe, O., Samara, A., & Westheim, K. (2006). Multivoiced supervision of Master's students: A case study of alternative supervision practices in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(3), 299-318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600680562>
- Knight, S., Shibani, A., Abel, S., Gibson, A., Ryan, P., Sutton, N., Wight, R., Lucas, C., Sándor, A., Kitto, K., Liu, M., Mogarkar, R. V., & Buckingham Shum, S. (2020). AcaWriter: A learning analytics tool for formative feedback on academic writing. *Journal of Writing Research*, 12(1), 141-186. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2020.12.01.06>
- Maxwell, T. W., & Smyth, R. (2011). Higher degree research supervision: From practice toward theory. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(2), 219-231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2010.509762>
- Rapp, C., & Kauf, P. (2018). Scaling Academic Writing Instruction: Evaluation of a Scaffolding Tool (Thesis Writer). *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 28, 590-615. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-017-0162-z>
- Rapp, C., Kruse, O., & Schlatter, U. (2020). The impact of writing technology on conceptual alignment in BA thesis supervision. In C. Müller Werder & J. Erlemann (Eds.), *Seamless Learning – lebenslanges, durchgängiges Lernen ermöglichen [Seamless Learning – enabling lifelong learning]* (pp. 180-189). Waxmann.
- Schober, M. F. (2005). Conceptual Alignment in Conversation. In B. F. Malle & S. D. Hodges (Eds.), *Other minds: How humans bridge the divide between self and others* (pp. 239-252). Guilford.
- Vehviläinen, S., & Löfström, E. (2016). 'I wish I had a crystal ball': discourses and potentials for developing academic supervising. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(3), 508-524. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.942272>

Christian Rapp

Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Zurich, Switzerland
Christian Rapp is Head of Educational Technology, Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning, School of Management and Law, ZHAW. Co-founder of Thesis Writer (www.thesiswriter.eu).

Otto Kruse

Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Zurich, Switzerland
Otto Kruse is a retired professor at the Zurich University of Applied Sciences. He is specialized in the teaching and research of academic writing. He was and is involved in several international research projects exploring writing in European higher education and currently is focusing on digital writing, developing Thesis Writer, a tool supporting dissertation writers.

“In this presentation we report on the development of ...” What we learned about structure of research papers across disciplines from collecting research article phrases for an Academic Phrasebook in another language than English

Lotte Rienecker, Peter Stray Jørgensen, Anne Sofie Jakobsen

An academic phrasebook or phrase compilation is a teaching resource to help students, researchers and supervisors to pick and use suitable academic phrases for papers, articles and reports. An academic phrase is a sequence of words that relates to the discourse structure of academic texts.

But to be really useful an academic phrase compilation should be structured in a way that resonates with how academic texts are structured. To create such a structure the context of the phrases included in the compilation need to be analysed qualitatively.

We present a research based compilation of academic phrases together with suggestions on how this compilation can be used in the teaching of academic writing. We will also briefly outline our phrase collection methodology. Our compilation is based on an analysis of approximately 100 peer reviewed research articles and scientific reports from both soft and hard disciplines. This analysis was guided by the following research aims: Phrases had to be authentic and occur across disciplines, all elements of a standard structure had to be represented, and phrases had to be related to the genre of academic research articles and scientific reports.

Results showed a set of 43 obligatory and optional moves and confirmed how academic phrases are nested in an elaborated set of steps, moves (Swales, 1990), structure and genre of research papers. In our presentation, we will focus on this set of 43 moves that structure the compilation and how this structure supports the learning and use of academic phrases for both novice and experienced writers. Teaching academic writing with a focus on how phrases, moves and structure are interconnected can be beneficial for student writers as it helps them both understand how the academic text works and how to linguistically create structure, cohesion and argument in the text.

References:

- Academic Phrasebank - A compendium of commonly used phrasal elements in Academic English in PDF format. Edition (2019) (<http://www.kfs.edu.eg/com/pdf/2082015294739.pdf>)
- Le, Thi Ngoc Phuong (2013). Phraseologies in the Discussion Section of Applied Linguistics Research Articles. MA Dissertation, University of Queensland.
- Flowerdew, L. (2015). Using corpus-based research and online academic corpora to inform writing of the discussion section of a thesis. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. Vol. 20 s. 58-68
- Godfrey, J. (2013). *The Student Phrase Book. Vocabulary for Writing at University*. UK/USA Palgrave Study Skills
- Jakobsen, A. S. (2018). *Danish Academic Vocabulary: Four studies on the words of academic written Danish*. Det Humanistiske Fakultet, Københavns Universitet. [https://forskning.ku.dk/soeg/result/?pure=da%2Fpublications%2Fdanish-academic-vocabulary/dd2e8fd7-6b55-45ea-980e-7f75b0f39574\).html](https://forskning.ku.dk/soeg/result/?pure=da%2Fpublications%2Fdanish-academic-vocabulary/dd2e8fd7-6b55-45ea-980e-7f75b0f39574).html)
- Peacock, M. (2011). The Structure of the Methods Section in Research Articles Across Eight Disciplines. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 7 (2) s. 99-124.
- Rienecker, L., Jørgensen, P.S., and Jakobsen, A.S., *Akademiske frase – til opgaver, projekter og artikler* (Academic phrases – for research papers, projects and articles) (2020) Frederiksberg, Samfundslitteratur.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lotte Rienecker

Roskilde University, Denmark

Lotte Rienecker, MPsych, has since 1997 worked with and written about (the teaching of) academic writing, the supervision of writing, HE teaching and learning, mainly as a textbook writer, and mainly in Danish. Best known is *Den gode opgave* (with Peter Stray Jørgensen et al., 1st ed. 1997, 5th ed. 2017), now sold in over 160.000 copies, and translated into English and Scandinavian languages [English: *The Good Paper*, 2017]. Lotte's latest textbook publications are *Akademiske frase – til opgaver, projekter og artikler* (2020) [*Academic Phrases*], and *Peer feedback – hvorfor og hvordan?* (2021) [*Peer feedback – why and how?*]

Lotte Rienecker chaired Eataw 1999-2001.

Peter Stray Jørgensen

Samfundslitteratur Publishers, Copenhagen, Denmark

Peter Stray Jørgensen holds an MA in Danish language, literature and communication. Peter has worked with academic writing university teaching and learning at all levels since 1996, for MA- and doctoral students and for staff. Peter has (co-)authored a number of books on (teaching) academic writing and the supervision of writing. Best known is *Den gode opgave* (with Lotte Rienecker et al. 2017, first ed. 1997), now sold in over 160.000 copies, and translated into English and Scandinavian languages [English: *The Good Paper*, 2017]. He is currently a publishing consultant at Samfundslitteratur (Danish publisher) and freelance consultant in higher education.

Anne Sofie Jakobsen

University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

Anne Sofie Jakobsen holds a PhD from the University of Copenhagen where she also earned her MA in English and Linguistics. She has taught courses on foreign language acquisition and on academic language and vocabulary and has worked with language courses for staff and students with a particular focus on Danish as a second language. In her PhD she explored the concept of a Danish academic vocabulary and developed an academic word list for Danish. She currently works at the Danish National Centre for Foreign Languages that aims to strengthen and support foreign language learning and teaching in Denmark.

Academic writing and retention

Ira (Irina) Ruppo

This paper examines the results of a quantitative study of the relationship between problems with academic writing and student retention. The background of the study was the absence of writing as a separate factor in most student retention models. It was theorised that this absence might be due to the predominant view of writing as a single element within academic studies as opposed to a complex and multi-modal process, involving students' background and skill-acquisition, social context, behaviour and time-management, as well emotional and psychological well-being.

In order to test this possibility and to gain insight into the possible connection between academic writing issues and student contemplation of withdrawal, a survey was designed and administered to undergraduate students at a university in Ireland. The survey drew on the model of the writing process developed by Sarah Haas (2009) and the foundations of successful writing practice by Helen Sword (2019) in order to identify various writing issues within social, emotional, behavioural, and artisanal contexts.

The analysis of the survey responses was twofold: (1) to identify the kind of writing problems faced by the students who contemplate withdrawing from the university, and (2) to compare their answers to two other groups: those who did not contemplate withdrawal, and those who considered leaving the university but did not claim problems with academic writing as a factor.

The results of the survey provide a breakdown of the challenges faced by students who see issues with academic writing as a factor in their contemplation of withdrawal, ranging from the need for more support to lack of confidence and writing anxiety. A comparison of their responses to the responses of the other two groups suggests that some writing-related issues, such as the perception of writing as isolating, may also play an indirect role in student attrition.

References

- Haas, S. (2009). Writer's groups for MA ESOL students: collaboratively constructing a model of the writing process. *ELTED Journal*, 2, 23-9.
- Moore-Cherry, N., Quin, S., & Burroughs, E. (2015). Why Students Leave: Findings From Qualitative Research Into Student Non-completion In Higher Education In Ireland (Focused Research Report No. 4). National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.
- Pigott, V., & Frawley, D. (2019). *An Analysis of Completion in Irish Higher Education 2007/2008 Entrants: A Report by the Higher Education Authority*. Higher Education Authority.
- Ruecker, T., Shepherd, D., Estrem, H., & Brunk-Chavez, B. (Eds.). (2017). *Retention, persistence, and writing programs*. University Press of Colorado.
- Soliday, M. (2011). *Everyday genres: Writing assignments across the disciplines*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: SIU Press.
- Sword, H. (2017). *Air & light & time & space: How successful academics write*. Harvard University Press.

Ira (Irina) Ruppo

NUI Galway, Ireland

Irina Ruppo manages the Academic Writing Centre at the National University of Ireland Galway, where she also teaches in the School of English and Creative Arts. She is the author of *Ibsen and the Irish Revival* (2010) and several other publications on Irish and world modernist literature and theatre. Her recent article on using Stanislavsky's techniques for training actors with writing centre tutors is forthcoming in Joseph Cheatle and Megan Jewel *Redefining Roles* (Utah State University Press, 2021).

Exploring English academic writing in social sciences and humanities (SSH) in Polish national journals: An exploratory corpus based study of writing in philosophy

Aleksandra M. Swatek

Examination of writing in English for Publication Purposes (ERPP) using corpus linguistics methods has predominantly focused on corpora consisting of articles published in high impact international journals (e.g. Gray, 2015). This presentation will explore the question of the bias in research on academic writing that skews towards writing done in mostly Inner Circle (Kachru, 1985) contexts such as USA, the UK, and the omission of publications in context of Expanding Circles (such as Eastern and Central European) and gray areas of academic publishing (Fazel & Hartse, 2020).

Using critical plurilingualism (Englander & Corcoran, 2019) as a key concept, I will describe the position of academic writers who publish in English in the national journals in SSH in Poland, focusing specifically on writing in philosophy. Secondly, I will reflect on the challenges of teaching academic EFL writing in the humanities, taking up the case of philosophy. Finally, using genre analysis and corpus linguistics methods, I will present preliminary findings related to similarities and differences in use of linguistic features in philosophy writing that is present in national journals as contrasted with international journals. The differing patterns of register variation will be discussed in terms of their impact on teaching academic writing, the position of Polish scholars in the international academic publication, as well as the questions of the need to broaden inclusion of more diverse writing patterns (McIntosh, Connor, Gokpinar-Shelton, 2017).

References

- Englander, K., & Corcoran, J. N. (2019). *English for research publication purposes: Critical plurilingual pedagogies*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429053184>
- Fazel, I., & Hartse, J. H. (2020). Gray areas of academic publishing: 'Predatory journals' under the lens. *Journal of English for Research Publication Purposes*, 1(2), 184-194. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jerpp.20008.faz>
- Gray, B. (2015). Linguistic variation in research articles. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.71>
- Kachru, Braj B. (1985) Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. In *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*. Ed. R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 11-30.
- McIntosh, K., Connor, U., & Gokpinar-Shelton, E. (2017). What intercultural rhetoric can bring to EAP/ESP writing studies in an English as a lingua franca world. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 29, 12-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2017.09.001>

Aleksandra M. Swatek

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland
Aleksandra M. Swatek is an Assistant Research Professor at the Scholarly Communication Research Group, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland. She graduated with a PhD in English specializing in second language studies and writing from Purdue University. Currently, she is leading a project funded by the National Science Center in Poland focused on the academic writing of early career scholars in social sciences and the humanities.

A descriptive report on an English Academic Writing and Research Center for Publication Purposes

Hacer Hande Uysal, Batuhan Selvi

English has secured its position as the primary language of scholarly publications and international research, involving more than 5.5 million scholars and 2,000 publishers all over the world (Lillis & Curry, 2010). The growing interest in publishing in English has resulted in the emergence of a new research field: English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP) (Cargill & Burgess, 2008). It has been revealed in the literature that international scholars experience a number of troubles and difficulties in writing for publication processes (Flowerdew, 2008). We believe that the continuous support and assistance provided in writing centers may offer solutions for international scholars regarding their academic publication problems. Therefore, in this paper, we would like to introduce an English Academic Writing and Research Center: Gazi University Academic Writing Center (GUAWC) as a successful example for this purpose. GUAWC is unique in the way that it was established as both a teaching and research center. In addition, contrary to general academic writing centers that generally focus on student writing, GUAWC aimed at improving English academic texts, such as articles and books, particularly for publishing purposes, and to support academic staff in their endeavors to publish internationally by means of one-on-one tutorials. This paper presents a descriptive report of the processes we went through while establishing, implementing, and evaluating the writing center, such as funding the writing center, conducting a needs analysis to identify the writing and publishing problems of academic staff, training tutors, and conducting an evaluation study to understand to what extent the center succeeded to provide solutions to the scholars’ reported challenges in writing for publication in English.

References

Lillis, T. M., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context*. London: Routledge.

Cargill, M., & Burgess, S. (2008). Introduction to the special issue: English for research publication purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2(7), 75-76.

Flowerdew, J. (2008). Scholarly writers who use English as an Additional Language: What can Goffman’s “Stigma” tell us?. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(2), 77-86.

Hacer Hande Uysal
Hacettepe University/ELT Department, Ankara, Turkey
Hacer Hande Uysal is currently a professor of English Language Teaching at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey. She received her master’s degree on English Education and her Ph.D. in Foreign Language/ESL Education from The University of Iowa. Her research interests are second language writing, intercultural rhetoric, academic discourse, early language teaching, and language planning and policy.

Batuhan Selvi
Firat University/ELT Department, Elazığ, Turkey
Batuhan Selvi is a research assistant at English Language Teaching department at Firat University. His research interests are second language writing, academic writing, and writing for publication.

The needs of Turkish scholars in writing for publishing purposes in English

Hacer Hande Uysal, Batuhan Selvi

Today, a huge amount of universities all over the world operate writing centers to provide writing assistance and support (Chang, 2013). This support is noteworthy, particularly for international scholars searching for publications in eminent international journals. Adjusting the writing centers to address the needs of international scholars may offer solutions to their problems in the scholarly writing process. In such writing centers, international scholars can reduce their burdens, alter main concerns, improve their stylistic and rhetorical skills, gain self-confidence, and become better writers with the assistance of one-on-one consultations carried out with experienced tutors (Davis, 2006). Therefore, it is important to analyze and identify the needs of scholars in a specific context as the stakeholders of the writing centers. The aim of this study is to analyze the academic writing needs of Turkish scholars in order to tailor our writing center in accordance with their needs. The study was carried out at a large-scale Turkish-medium state university in Ankara, Turkey. An online need analysis survey was sent to all of the scholars working at the university. A total of 366 participants took part in the study. The findings demonstrated that more than half of the participants considered writing a research article in English as difficult and a majority of them also stated that they were rejected, at least once, by international journals. In addition, they indicated that writing a research paper in English was different than writing in Turkish in terms of logic and rules. Finally, it was found that the participants had the greatest difficulty in writing the discussion section of the research article. Specific difficulties of Turkish writers in terms of both macro and micro-skills of academic writing and their expectations from writing centers were also revealed in detail through both closed and open-ended questions. The findings of this study may provide valuable insights into writing centers, especially those focusing on improving English academic texts for publishing purposes.

References

Chang, T. S. (2013). The idea of a writing center in Asian countries: A preliminary search of models in Taiwan. *Praxis: a writing center Journal*, 10(2), 1-9.

Davis, K. (2006). The writing center as the last best place: Six easy pieces on Montana, bears, love, and writing centers. *The Writing Center Journal*, 26(2), 31-41.

Hacer Hande Uysal
Hacettepe University/ELT Department, Ankara, Turkey
Hacer Hande Uysal is currently a professor of English Language Teaching at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey. She received her master's degree on English Education and her Ph.D. in Foreign Language/ESL Education from The University of Iowa. Her research interests are second language writing, intercultural rhetoric, academic discourse, early language teaching, and language planning and policy.

Batuhan Selvi
Firat University/ELT Department, Elazığ, Turkey
Batuhan Selvi is a research assistant at English Language Teaching department at Firat University. His research interests are second language writing, academic writing, and writing for publication.

Basements, bedrooms, and parking lots: The physical and emotional spaces of writing during a pandemic

Bronwyn T. Williams

With the move to online instruction on many campuses in spring 2020, university students not only had their writing processes disrupted, but had to adapt almost immediately to writing in new physical and emotional circumstances. Ethnographic research into literacy practices has often recognized the importance of place in writing processes and perceptions of agency (Pahl, 2014; Vasudevan, 2014; Williams, 2018). Yet the drastic shifts in, and shocks to, writing practices necessitated by the pandemic forced many to confront and respond to new experiences of place and mobility on their writing processes. In this presentation I will discuss a research project undertaken during the pandemic in which I interviewed more than 40 students from a research university, from first-year to doctoral students, about their efforts to adapt to their altered writing situations. I did one set of interviews in April and May, with follow-up interviews in November and December. The changes in where and when they could write, as well as their restricted movements, heightened the writers' awareness about the role of place and mobility in their writing. Yet writing from home during the pandemic involved more than just a shift in location and materials. The writers' descriptions of place and writing became more intimately involved with their descriptions of their embodied and affective responses to writing practices. Place, as narrative, social location, and even metaphor, established a prominence in student writers' literacy practices in ways few had experienced before. I conclude by discussing how writers' responses to this traumatic situation offer insights into the interanimating effects of location, embodiment, and affect in terms of student agency in writing.

Pahl, K. (2014). *Materializing literacies in communities: The uses of literacy revisited*. Bloomsbury.

Vasudevan, L. (2014). Multimodal cosmopolitanism: Cultivating belonging in everyday moments with youth. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 44(1), 45-67.

Williams, B.T. (2018). *Literacy practices and perceptions of agency: Composing identities*. Routledge.

Bronwyn T. Williams

University of Louisville, Louisville, USA

Bronwyn T. Williams is a professor of English and director of the University Writing Centre at the University of Louisville. He writes and teaches on issues of literacy, identity, digital media, sustainability, and community engagement. His most recent book is *Literacy Practices and Perceptions of Agency: Composing Identities*. Previous books include *New Media Literacies and Participatory Popular Culture Across Borders*; *Shimmering Literacies: Popular Culture and Reading and Writing Online*; and *Identity Papers: Literacy and Power in Higher Education*.

Academic writing development of master's thesis pair writers: The impact of negotiating and assigning writerly identities

Tine Wirenfeldt Jensen, Helle Merete Nordentoft, Søren Smedegaard Bengtsen

Writing a master's thesis in groups or pairs has been possible for many years in Danish universities, and the use of this possibility varies greatly across universities and educational programmes. However, in recent years some programmes have seen a steep increase in the number of students writing in pairs - in one faculty a 300% rise in three years (Nordentoft et al., 2020). This change is at least partly the result of Higher Education reforms, a renewed focus on streamlining the master's thesis process and a rise in collective supervision formats.

Research on thesis writing in groups does exist, but little is known about writing a master's thesis in pairs. How do writing in pairs affect the students' development as academic writers? How does pair-writers experience and needs differ from those of individual or group writers? To support pair-writers, both master's thesis supervisors and academic writing support need more knowledge about their writing process.

Data consist of joint reflections of four master's thesis writing pairs (8 students). Each pair recorded reflections guided by a set of reflective questions three times during their thesis writing process. A total of 12 joint reflections was recorded and transcribed. This data was then coded thematically using grounded theory methods (Charmaz, 2006) and the constructed themes informed a discourse analysis of the material (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001).

The findings suggest that master's thesis pair-writers build on prior friendship and early on negotiate and assign fixed writerly identities (Ivanič, 1998). These identities seem to serve as a way of creating boundaries and build trust, allowing the students to write in shared documents, give each other feedback and revise each other's text. This strategy seems to enable the students to write together but can also act as a constraint in their individual development as academic writers.

References

- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory. A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Sage.
- Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Laclau, E., & C. Mouffe (2001). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. Verso.
- Nordentoft, H., Jensen, T. W., & Bengtsen, S. (2020). "Vi er rigtig meget ens": Peer-dynamik i samarbejdet mellem specialeskrivende par. *Dansk Universitetspædagogisk Tidsskrift*, 16(28), 107-123. ["We are very much alike": Peer-dynamics in the collaboration of master's thesis writing pairs].

Tine Wirenfeldt Jensen

Southern University of Denmark, Centre for Teaching and Learning, Odense, Denmark/ METoDo, Aarhus, Denmark

PhD in educational research - higher education. Teaches and researches academic writing with a focus on Master's thesis and doctoral writing as well as supervision across disciplines. Has published on the role of the master's thesis, master's thesis supervision, peer feedback and academic writing in higher education.

Helle Merete Nordentoft

Associate professor, MA, PhD.

Department of Educational Science, Danish School of Education (DPU), Aarhus University, Denmark

Helle teaches and researches collective and interdisciplinary forms of supervision practices in health care and educational contexts. In higher education she has published on creative approaches to collective supervision and competence development, digital formats in peer feedback and master's thesis supervision.

Søren Smedegaard Bengtsen

Associate professor, PhD.

Department of Educational Philosophy and General Education, Danish School of Education (DPU), Aarhus University, Denmark

Bengtsen is an Associate Professor in supervision and mentoring in higher education, and his research focuses on supervision on the Master's and PhD levels and the interconnections between higher education policy and reforms and the supervision practices and dialogues between students and supervisors. Also, he is the Co-Director of the research centre 'Centre for Higher Education Futures' (CHEF) at the Danish School of Education, Aarhus University.

They just don't get it: A referencing error analysis

Kristien Andrianatos, Tobie van Dyk

A central concern for academic writing teachers is to guide students through finding, processing and presenting information. For students to formulate a well-supported academic argument, proper source integration skills need to be applied. Consequently, the prerequisites for successful source integration depend on a student's ability to quote or paraphrase sources and adhere to referencing styles' technical requirements (Hyland, 1999). Academic writing teachers need to investigate which aspects of source integration students fail to master (Petric, 2012). By utilising the multilevel, multigenre, multi-language learner corpus of South African languages for academic purposes compiled by the Inter-institutional Centre for Language Development and Assessment (ICELDA) and the South African Centre for Digital Language Resources (SADiLaR), we performed an error analysis of typical referencing errors and the frequency of specific kinds of referencing errors in student academic writing. Preliminary findings indicated consistent technical mistakes with citation format, which seems to be a symptom of their inability to find credible sources. Furthermore, students are ineffective in formatting reference lists; for example, a student merely copies a URL rather than write a full entry. Herewith we attempt to open a discussion on what pedagogical inferences one can come to, to design appropriate and adequate support mechanisms for correspondence students in the South African context. This knowledge can unlock focussed interventions to assist students with source integration. According to Gravett and Kinchin (2020), successful source integration plays a role in developing students' identities within the academic community. We want to move beyond having an idea of what mistakes they make, to an in-depth analysis of recurring errors to offer focussed academic writing support.

References

- Gravett, K., & Kinchin, I. M. (2020) The role of academic referencing within students' identity development. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2020.1766665>
- Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(3), 341-367.
- Petric, B. (2012). Legitimate textual borrowing: Direct quotation in L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 102-117.

Dr Kristien Andrianatos

North-West University (NWU), Potchefstroom, South Africa

Dr Kristien Andrianatos is an academic literacy lecturer in the School of Languages at the North-West University. She teaches academic writing to first-year distance students, and her research focus is reading in higher education and multimodal interventions. Her PhD was on the reading support of first-year students which she obtained in 2018. She is involved in various multimodal blended learning projects within the field of academic literacy.

Prof Tobie van Dyk

North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa

Tobie van Dyk is professor of applied linguistics at North-West University's School of Languages. His expertise is in the field of language for academic purposes and assessing academic language ability. He is project leader of a number of projects (some of these involve international partners), that focus on academic language development. He also published extensively in peer reviewed academic journals and several postgraduate studies were completed under his supervision.

To infinity and beyond: Positioning writing support in universities

Monica Broido, Harriet Rubin

Academic culture is constantly evolving, so writing and language centers must change to meet these new challenges. At Tel Aviv University, the writing center, known as CLE (Center for Language Excellence) in the Division of Languages, presents an innovative model, incorporating not only writing but other language skills and other languages for different populations, from undergraduates to post-graduates and faculty. Our center works with our Division’s writing programs in most faculties across the campus and have created an online reference course open to all graduate students.

CLE has evolved into a “hub” that not only provides support for local Israeli students, but also expands its reach to align itself with the university’s aim to embrace international students in its over twenty degree programs offered entirely in English. Additionally, the university aims to help its local Israeli students reap the benefits of studying abroad through new initiatives such as “Internationalization at Home”. And while Hebrew remains the main medium of instruction, a new national requirement is for all undergraduate students to take two content courses of their choice taught in English, namely EMI (English Medium Instruction). In all these new ventures, our writing and language center has proactively re-positioned itself within the university as the place where support for these take place.

Over the years, we have established a working relationship with the faculty deans and the university Rectorate; periodically presenting our added-value and creatively coming up with programs to help achieve the university’s vision. In this short talk, we present our model, share how our center has evolved into a trusted partner across campus, and also offer recommendations for expanding the role of writing centers, thus bringing greater saliency to the importance of writing and communication support at all levels for multiple populations and purposes.

Monica Broido

Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

Monica Broido is Head of the Academic Writing Programs at Tel Aviv University, where she teaches academic/science writing to PhD students in several faculties. She also created an online writing course for all the university’s graduate populations and faculty. In addition, she is presently co-chair of the Israel Forum for Academic Writing (IFAW) at the Mofet Institute. Her research interests include curriculum planning and educational technology implementation at the tertiary level.

Harriet Rubin

Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

Harriet Rubin is the Director of the writing center at Tel Aviv University, known as CLE - Center for Language Excellence, which offers 1:1 support and workshops for students, faculty, administrative staff, and people from the community. At the university, she teaches English as an additional language at all levels, with a focus on academic and professional writing. She is also presently co-chair of the Israel Forum for Academic Writing (IFAW) at the Mofet Institute.

Innovative means of teaching referencing: The NWU library’s *Referella* intervention package

Anneke Coetzee, Zander Janse van Rensburg

Academic attribution is one of the cornerstones of academic writing (Hyland, 1996; Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011). Novice academic writers consistently demonstrate a lack of applying the technical aspects of citing sources (Vardi, 2012). A rising student population and a lack of training capacity leave a significant shortage in addressing the referencing skills deficit. At the North-West University (NWU), the ratio of students to referencing teachers is approximately 1600:1. However, 42 of these staff members teach referencing to first-year students, whereas the remainder work in the library services. This poses a severe risk to the Institutions’ ability to teach referencing and support referencing related queries. A group of academic writing practitioners and the Library collaborated to develop a multimodal intervention package to address this persistent gap. This multimodal intervention led to a digital “make-over” of the hardcopy and PDF style guides (New London Group, 2000; Kress, 2003), consisting of three components: dynamic style guides, video tutorials and a test and quiz platform. Referella is the centrepiece of the intervention who presents video tutorials, thereby addressing the visual preference of digital natives (Fieldhouse & Nicholas, 2008; Neumann, 2016). This digitised format has been beneficial since the NWU has moved to full-scale online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. We would like to illustrate our Referella package and share insights on multimodal referencing interventions in this session. By sharing our experiences on developing Referella, we hope to stimulate a fruitful discussion on multimodal approaches in teaching academic attribution.

References

Fieldhouse, M., & Nicholas, D. (2008). Digital literacy as information savvy. In C. Lankshear, & M. Knobel, M. (Eds.), *Digital literacy: Concepts, policies and practices* (pp. 47-72). Peter Lang.

Hyland, K. (1996). Nurturing hedges in the ESP curriculum. *System*, 24(4), 477-490.

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. Routledge.

Mansourizadeh, K., & Ahmad, U. K. (2011). Citation practices among non-native expert and novice scientific writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10(3), 152-161.

Neumann, C. (2016). Teaching digital natives: Promoting information literacy and addressing instructional challenges. *Reading Improvement*, 53(3), 101-106.

New London Group. (2000). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. In B. Cope, & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (pp. 9-37). Routledge.

Vardi, I. (2012). Developing students’ referencing skills: A matter of plagiarism, punishment and morality or of learning to write critically? *Higher Education Research & Development*, 31(6), 921-930.

Anneke Coetzee
North-West University (NWU), Potchefstroom, South Africa
Ms Anneke Coetzee has been a Faculty Librarian for Humanities at the North-West University, Potchefstroom Campus since 1990 (which makes her a fixture). She holds a postgraduate diploma in Library and Information Sciences. She is currently supporting postgraduate students in the Research Commons. She has a vast knowledge of referencing styles and has assisted numerous students and faculty members with this aspect of their theses and dissertations. She teaches referencing skills to undergraduates and postgraduates. The NWU referencing guide is her responsibility.

Zander Janse van Rensburg
North-West University (NWU), Potchefstroom, South Africa
Zander Janse van Rensburg recently obtained a master’s degree in philosophy with the focus on Paul Ricoeur’s hermeneutic phenomenology. Currently, he is the NWU Writing Centre manager, academic literacy lecturer, and subject-specialist: plagiarism. In addition, he serves as the Treasurer of the South African Association of Language Teaching. As a practitioner in teaching academic writing, he is especially interested in the intersection between academic misconduct and academic writing.

Publish and Flourish: Systemic approach to doctoral writing at VSB-Technical University of Ostrava

Kamila Etchegoyen Rosolová, Alena Kašpárková, Eleanor Lurring

Czech doctoral students are not usually offered structural mechanisms of writing support in their institutions, but they are often required to publish their research in English and in high impact journals adhering to conventions foreign to Czech students. In the absence of models for doctoral writing pedagogies in Czech education, we have joined forces to develop our own. Our pedagogical model for doctoral writing in English for publication is a product of collaboration between the Center for Academic Writing of the Czech Academy of Sciences and VSB-Technical University Ostrava, and we will scale it for use in other higher education institutions in the Czech Republic. This presentation provides a brief overview of our model, taking a systemic view to address the development of doctoral students’ research literacies. The model consists of genre-based, blended-learning courses to teach writing for publication in English, workshops for supervisors, a teacher manual, and training for future writing developers. Overall, we aim to empower doctoral students as writers, focusing on ‘producing better writers, not better texts’ (North, 1984); building writing habits/improving time-management (Belcher, 2019); and helping students develop a growth-oriented mindset (Powell and Driscoll, 2020; Dweck, 2008). As some components are still a work-in-progress, we introduce only the blended-learning courses for doctoral students and the teacher manual. We aspire for our model to serve as a launching pad for discourse on writing pedagogies and research literacies in our context, where such a discourse has not yet developed. We are hoping to offer highly practical tools that will enhance the quality of education of our doctoral students.

References

Belcher, Wendy Laura (2019). *Writing Your Journal Article in Twelve Weeks: A Guide to Academic Publishing Success* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Dweck, C. S. (2008). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House Digital, Inc.

North, S. (1984). The Idea of a Writing Center. *College English*, 46(5), 433-446. doi:10.2307/377047

Powell, R.L., & Driscoll, D. L. (2020). How Mindsets Shape Response and Learning Transfer: A Case of Two Graduate Writers. *Journal of Response to Writing*: Vol. 6: 2, Article 3. Available at: <https://scholar.archive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol6/iss2/3>

Kamila Etchegoyen Rosolová
Centre for Academic Writing, Czech Academy of Sciences, Czech Republic
Kamila Etchegoyen Rosolová is Head of the Department of Language Studies housed within the Czech Language Institute, Czech Academy of Sciences. With a PhD in Educational Policy from Michigan State University, she has had a long-standing interest in teaching and learning, and more specifically in doctoral writing pedagogies. She started the Center for Academic Writing in her department in 2011 where she has developed and taught blended-learning courses in academic writing. She also frequently gives workshops on academic writing to researchers and doctoral students of diverse disciplinary backgrounds.

Alena Kašpárková
VSB-Technical University of Ostrava, Czech Republic
Alena Kašpárková works at VSB-Technical University of Ostrava. Thanks to her educational background (language teaching, coaching, and environmental science), she helps doctoral students and her fellow academics become better writers. In cooperation with her university library and the Centre for Academic Writing with the Czech Academy of Sciences, she works towards building a support system for academic writing and publication practice at the doctoral and early-career researcher level.

Eleanor Lurring
Centre for Academic Writing, Czech Academy of Sciences, Czech Republic
Eleanor Lurring currently teaches blended-learning courses, delivers workshops and designs materials for the Centre for Academic Writing. RSA diploma-qualified, and with an MBA and MA in Applied Linguistics and TESOL, she has wide-ranging experience in teaching, materials development and teacher training, including ten years as a DELTA tutor.

Teaching academic writing: Tensions, negotiations and considerations

Cathinka Dahl Hambro, Ingerid S. Straume

As teachers of academic writing based at a writing centre in a university library, we face expectations from faculty on how we train students to become better writers. These expectations are not always in accordance with our own practices, experiences and research in process-oriented writing. Consequently, a tension arises between what we are expected to deliver and our own beliefs and practices. The paper addresses this tension and how we negotiate with faculty in order to deliver both in accordance with their wishes and our own pedagogic convictions.

A common perception of academic writing is that it follows certain rules and conventions related to language, structure and style. Faculty often expect that we provide their students with a recipe on how to write academic papers. As experienced writing advisors, we know that few learn to write academically simply by implementing a list of tips and advice on what constitutes ‘good’ writing. Rather, the students might need help to get started on their writing process and learn by doing. They may need help to find their work meaningful and understand the point of writing something that only their examiner will read, before they are ready to make sense of rules and conventions pertaining to academic writing.

As academic writing practitioners, it is our job to communicate with faculty how we may contribute constructively by activating the students and giving them tools to help them grow as writers. Focusing on the pre-teaching phase in didactic theory and process writing, we share examples of how we negotiate expectations and possible tensions with faculty in advance of courses, and how we work to raise awareness about writing process and constructive feedback (feedforward) through courses in academic development for faculty. In so doing, we will contribute with strategies that may help others avoid misunderstandings in similar situations.

References (APA 7)

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43:8,1315-1325, DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354

Dawson, P. (2017). Assessment rubrics: towards clearer and more replicable design, research and practice. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42:3,347-360, DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2015.1111294

Dysthe, O., Hertzberg, F., & Hoel, T. L. (2000). *Skrive for å lære: skrivning i høyere utdanning* [Writing to learn: writing in higher education] (2nd ed). Abstrakt.

Nygaard, L. (2015) *Writing for Scholars. A Practical Guide to Making Sense & Being Heard*. 2nd ed. SAGE

Wingate, U. (2010). The impact of formative feedback on the development of academic writing. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35:5, 519-533, DOI:10.1080/02602930903512909

Cathinka Dahl Hambro
University of Oslo, Norway
Cathinka Dahl Hambro is senior research librarian and director of the Academic Writing Centre at University of Oslo. Her academic background is within medieval studies, Irish philology, English and theology. She holds a PhD in Irish philology and medieval studies (2013) and an MA in theology (2018).

Ingerid S. Straume
Univeristy of Oslo, Norway
Ingerid Straume is director of the writing programme and founder of the writing centre at Oslo University Library. She has a diverse background, and holds a PhD in the philosophy of education with a thesis on Cornelius Castoriadis. Straume has published extensively on the politics and psychology of education, autonomy, identity and recognition. Latest book: *Skriveren og teksten: Fortellinger om identitet og faglig skrivning* [The writer and the text: Stories about identity and writing in the disciplines].

Writers, writers everywhere, but no writing center: The first year of the Masaryk University Writing Lab

Joe Lennon

Over the last year, my colleagues and I have taken the first steps in establishing an English Writing Lab at the Masaryk University Language Centre in Brno, Czech Republic. We hope that the Writing Lab will serve the same vital function as writing centers in the US and UK – as an active resource for students, offering one-on-one consultations, writer's groups, online seminars, and a curated library of self-access advice. We hope that eventually the Writing Lab will be the university focal point for larger, interdisciplinary discussions about good practice in writing pedagogy. However, getting started hasn't been easy. There are only a few other small writing centers in the country, so there are no ready-made templates for how to adapt the model to a large Czech university. Our students and faculty (except some who have studied abroad) are unfamiliar with how a writing consultation works, or how a writing center can help under-served students (especially graduate students, many of whom are expected to publish in English even though they've never been given any training in writing). In my presentation, I will offer insights from the first year of the Writing Lab's existence – what we've done so far, how we have tried to adapt and familiarize writing center work to a Central European context, and where we've encountered the most help and the most resistance. I'll share data from our exit surveys about who has come to the Lab, what we've done in the consultations, and how the students perceived the experience. And I'll share what we've discovered from a university-wide analysis of writers' needs. I hope to inspire teachers interested in establishing a writing center at their school, but I will also advocate for, and give practical advice on, adapting collaborative elements of the writing center experience into the classroom.

References

- Bonazza, R. (2016). Locating L2 English writing centers in German universities. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 6(1), 1-16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18552/joaw.v6i1.283>
- Bräuer, G. (2002). Drawing connections across education: The Freiburg writing center model. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, 5(3), 25-34.
- Doroholschi, C. I., Tucan, D., Chitez, M., & Kruse, O. (2018). Introduction: Understanding academic writing in the context of Central and Eastern European higher education. In M. Chitez, C. I. Doroholschi., O. Kruse, Ł. Salski, & D. Tucan (Eds.), *University writing in Central and Eastern Europe: Tradition, transition, and innovation* (pp. 1-12). Springer.
- Harris, M. (1995). Talking in the middle: Why writers need writing tutors. *College English*, 57(1), 27-42.
- Frank, A., Haacke, S., & Tente, C. (2003). Contacts – conflicts – cooperation: A report from the Writing Lab of the University of Bielefeld. In L. Björk, G. Bräuer, L. Rienecker, & P. Stray Jørgensen (Eds.), *Studies in writing, volume 12: Teaching academic writing in European higher education* (pp. 165-174). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kašpárková, A., & Rosolová, K. E. (2020). A geocaching game 'Meet your editor' as a teaser for writing courses. *2020 IEEE International Professional Communication Conference (ProComm)* (pp. 87-91). IEEE. <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9201251>

Joe Lennon

Masaryk University Language Centre, Brno, Czech Republic

Joe Lennon has a PhD in English and Creative Writing from the University of Denver, and an Master of Fine Arts in Writing from Washington University in St. Louis. Over the last 16 years, he has taught EFL, academic writing and creative writing at universities in the US, China, and the Czech Republic. He is currently Assistant Professor at Masaryk University Language Centre, where he teaches academic writing in a variety of formats, and is the founder of the newly established Writing Lab. He has a cat named Professor Cuddles.

“But how do I explain that?” Training English writing center peer tutors

Natasha Msibi, Ruth Shannon, Rose Jacobs

Peer tutors are a core part of university writing center infrastructure, and influence both a center’s operations and the tone of the writing support (Boquet, 1999). The quality and efficacy of that support often hinge on the quality and efficacy of peer tutor training, making tutor training programs a central concern for many centers (Hill, 2016; Ronesi, 2009; Weissbach & Pflueger, 2018). At the Technical University of Munich’s English Writing Center, we have transformed a relatively informal approach to tutor training into a rigorous, formalized program ending in state certification. The most recent addition to our program is a workshop on pedagogical approaches to peer tutoring, focusing on teaching strategies and the peer relationship. We build from Jim Scrivener’s *Learning Teaching* (2011) for its focus on the teacher and the learning cycle. Scrivener employs a discursive approach that encourages reflection and debate, and our workshop is comprised of pair and group tasks designed to integrate tutors’ personal experience and apply it to our setting. It moves our program a step beyond content training (grammar, style, organization), towards helping participants think about the nature of their work as teachers. So far we have held one workshop with 14 tutors whose anonymous feedback suggests it helped them not just answer, but also broaden, one of their pressing questions: “How do I explain that?”

We would like to use one of the EATAW’s 10-minute teaching-oriented sessions to present the pedagogical workshop. We welcome advice and feedback about our program, but also hope to prompt wider questions about the extent to which non-professional writing tutors benefit from learning about pedagogical theories of teaching.

References

- Boquet, E. (1999). “Our Little Secret”: A History of Writing Centers, Pre- To Post-Open Admissions. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(3), 463-482. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/358861>
- Hill, H. (2016). Tutoring for Transfer: The Benefits of Teaching Writing Center Tutors about Transfer Theory. *The Writing Center Journal*, 35(3), 77-102. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43965691>
- Ronesi, L. (2009). Theory In/To Practice: Multilingual Tutors Supporting Multilingual Peers: A Peer-Tutor Training Course in the Arabian Gulf. *The Writing Center Journal*, 29(2), 75-94. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43460758>
- Scrivener, J. (1994). *Learning teaching*. Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann English Language Teaching.
- Weissbach, R. S., and Pflueger, R. C. (2018). Collaborating With Writing Centers on Interdisciplinary Peer Tutor Training to Improve Writing Support for Engineering Students. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 61(2), 206-220. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPC.2017.2778949>

Natasha Msibi

Technical University of Munich, Language Center, Munich, Germany

Natasha Msibi has been working at the TUM Language Center since 2015, first as a writing tutor and now as a lecturer and co-director of the English Writing Center. She holds a B.A. in linguistics and psychology from the University of South Africa and an M.A. in educational research from the TUM School of Education. She is passionate about improving higher education, and particularly teaching practices, through research.

Ruth Shannon

Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

Ruth Shannon was until recently co-director of the Technical University of Munich’s English Writing Center as well as an English lecturer at the university, teaching writing and literature courses. She earned a bachelor of arts in creative writing and literature from Bard College and a master’s degree in English Studies from Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München. Ruth is now based in Basel, Switzerland.

Rose Jacobs

Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

Rose Jacobs is an English lecturer at the Technical University of Munich’s language center and a co-director of the university’s English Writing Center. She is a graduate of the University of Michigan (B.A.) and comes to teaching by way of journalism.

Beyond reflection: The manifesto in doctoral writing development

Tom Muir, Kristin Solli

If writing pedagogy aims at writer development rather than text fixing, understanding how the writer sees that development is a key element of our skillset as writing teachers. In our writing course for doctoral students, we attempted to gain such understanding by including a reflective statement as part of the course exam. As such, we adopted a well-known strategy in much professional learning, where the use of reflective writing is often a standard element intended to both facilitate and document learning (Bjerkvik & Hilli, 2019; McGuire, Lay & Peters, 2009; Ross, 2014).

We became disillusioned with reflective statements, however. Our experience paralleled that of MacFarlane and Gourlay (2009) who show how reflective statements are often constructed out of mappable moves that can obstruct meaningful reflection. Seeking an antidote to the parroting of rhetorical moves risked by reflective statements, but also seeking to feed a creativity that is often underserved in academic writing provision (Thurlow, Morton & Choi, 2019), we began encouraging candidates to write manifestos instead.

A manifesto – in this case, a writing manifesto – is a statement of purpose, a call to arms. Reflection is built in – presupposed – but crucially, a manifesto speaks in the imperative and pushes the writer to be bold, decisive, playful and – often! – flamboyant. As recent work on pedagogical uses of manifestos show, they can create space for writers' agency and text ownership (Fahs, 2019; Williams, 2020).

This presentation will describe some of the manifestos we have received, discuss their place in the development of the writer and their place in our course. Our presentation will review our ongoing experiment with them – begun in 2017 – which has seen approximately 45 students choosing to submit a manifesto as part of their course exam. The manifestos' emerging value is that the writer must reframe their knowledge of writing by putting it into such a charged, propulsive genre. Students talk about this reframing as an empowering, even joyful, way of taking charge of their writing. The genre allows students to shift the way they see themselves as writers, and thus helps us as writing teachers, make space for student creativity and agency.

References

- Bjerkvik, L. K., & Hilli, Y. (2019). Reflective writing in undergraduate clinical nursing education: A literature review. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 35, 32-41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2018.11.013>
- Fahs, B. (2019). Writing with blood: The transformative pedagogy of teaching students to write manifestos. *Radical Teacher*, 115, 3-38.
- Macfarlane, B. & Gourlay, L. (2009) The reflection game: enacting the penitent self. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14(4), 455-459. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510903050244>
- McGuire, L., Lay, K., & Peters, J. (2009). Pedagogy of reflective writing in professional education. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 9(1), 93-107.
- Ross, J. (2014). Performing the reflective self: Audience awareness in high-stakes reflection. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(2), 219-232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.651450>
- Thurlow, S., Morton, J., & Choi, J. (2019). You can't be Shakespearean talking about the institutionalisation of sex offenders: Creativity and creative practices of multilingual doctoral writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 43, 46-56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.11.002>
- Williams, P. (2020). A writer's manifesto: Articulating ways of learning to write well. *New Writing*, 17(1), 71-79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790726.2019.1566366>

Tom Muir

OsloMet – Oslo Metropolitan University, Oslo, Norway

Dr Tom Muir is Associate Professor of English for Academic Purposes at OsloMet – Oslo Metropolitan University. He works mainly on writing development for doctoral students and other researchers. He is interested in phenomena at the margins of pedagogy – risk, creativity, ghosts, magic.

Kristin Solli

OsloMet – Oslo Metropolitan University, Oslo, Norway

Dr Kristin Solli works as an Associate Professor in the Unit for Academic Language and Practice at the University Library, OsloMet – Oslo Metropolitan University. She runs writing courses and workshops for doctoral students and researchers. Her research interests span academic writing, multilingual writing and research practices, and country & western music.

Developing students’ discipline-based academic literacies during medical education

Neslihan Onder-Ozdemir

To understand student learning, we should embed academic literacies within disciplinary contexts by providing students with some opportunities (e.g., encouraging students to use English outside the classroom) and embracing critical reflective thinking (Dooley & Grellier, 2020). Following Lillis and Scott (2007), in this study, the academic literacies approach is defined as *a social practice and transformation through elucidating*. This study aims to (i) investigate undergraduate medical students’ autonomous practices to produce texts, (ii) their opinions on their texts in critical EAP and ESP mainstream classrooms (n=26) and also (iii) examine the trajectories of their abstract writing, which were produced with the help of a literacy broker, during their medical education. The data were collected using observation, structured interviews and also textual histories of medical students’ writing, including the first draft, feedback and comments they received and the final version of their abstract, during and after their preparation in an undergraduate students’ congress in medicine, which medical students organize each year to discuss topics in medicine with a poster or oral presentation. Swales (2004) highlights the “apprenticeship” young scholars must experience, gaining experience while learning as “new comers”, which serves as the theoretical framework of this research. The findings showed that medical students used their academic literacies while writing an abstract as an extracurricular activity. The interview data showed that medical students were able to use the theoretical knowledge that they gained both in medical English and content courses in medicine to participate in academic activities outside the classroom. Drawing on Lillis and Curry (2010) and Willey and Tanimoto (2012), the examination of textual histories revealed the need for editing (e.g., deletion of pulmoner when defining embolism and replacing it with pulmonary embolism), especially concerning addition (insertion of words), deletion, substitution (replacement of words), rewriting, mechanical aspects (changes that do not affect the meaning, such as of assessment) and rewriting, guidance and constructive feedback.

References

Dooley, P. M., & Grellier, J. (2020). Developing academic literacies. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 14(2), 106-119.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English. London: Routledge.

Lillis, T., & Scott, M. (2007). Defining academic literacies research: Issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 5-32.

Swales, J. M. (2004). Research genres: Explorations and applications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willey, I., & Tanimoto, K. (2012). “Convenience Editing” in action: Comparing English teachers’ and medical professionals’ revisions of a medical abstract. *English for Specific Purposes*, 31(4), 249-260.

Neslihan Onder-Ozdemir

Bursa Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey

Neslihan Onder-Ozdemir completed her postgraduate education at the University of Sheffield under Prof. Dr. Nigel Harwood’s supervision in the UK. She received the best young scholar award in 2014 and the best postgraduate student award in 2013. Her research interests include English for specific/academic purposes, medical education, discourse analysis, vocational English, academic writing and corpus linguistics. She is currently coordinating and teaching Vocational English courses in the Faculty of Health Sciences and Faculty of Engineering at Bursa Uludağ University and also teaching medical English in Bursa Chamber of Medical Doctors in Turkey.

Reflecting on the digital transformation: A praxeological perspective on writing center work during COVID-19

Doris Pany-Habsa

The COVID-19 pandemic led to a large-scale shift from teaching writing in co-presence settings to synchronous and asynchronous digital teaching formats. This shift affected Writing Centers as well and led to extensive and crucial changes in the teaching and tutoring practices of Writing Centers. For Writing Centers which used to work predominantly in analogue settings before the pandemic, the digital transformation process turned out to be challenging and extremely time-consuming. Consequently, there were few opportunities to reflect on the longer-term implications of the changes underway.

The aim of this teaching-oriented contribution is to take a step back and reflect on the impact of the digitalization process our Writing Center at the University of Graz (Austria) underwent during the pandemic. In order to consider the changes and possible medium and long-term impacts in a theoretically systematized way, I choose a praxeological approach. According to this sociological theory, I conceive writing center work as a specific practice that embraces cognitive, material, cultural and social aspects. This perspective will be applied to a series of online learning videos our Writing Center created during the pandemic (“Digitale Inputs des Schreibzentrums”). The learning videos and the use we made of them will serve as an example to reflect on digital writing center practices. The paper aims at fostering the discussion about the meaning of digitalization in the context of writing center work and teaching academic writing by contributing observations gained from a reflection on our Writing Center’s practice during the COVID-19 pandemic.

References:

- Adedoyin, O. B., & Soykan, E. (2020). Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: The challenges and opportunities. *Interactive Learning Environments*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1813180>
- Paiz, J. M. (2018). Expanding the Writing Center: A Theoretical and Practical Toolkit for Starting an Online Writing Lab. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 21(4), 1-19.
- Reckwitz, A. (2003). Grundelemente einer Theorie sozialer Praktiken. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*. 32(4), 82-301.
- Le Grange, L. (2020). Could the Covid-19 Pandemic Accelerate the Uberfication of the University. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. 34(4), 1-10. <https://dx.doi.org/10.20853/34-4-4071>

Doris Pany-Habsa

University of Graz/Writing Center, Graz, Austria
Doris Pany-Habsa is the director of the Writing Center at the University of Graz (Austria). Originally trained in Literature and Cultural studies, she holds a PhD in General and Comparative Literature. Her interests are Interdisciplinary Writing Research, Writing Pedagogy and Writing Center Work. Latest Publication: Knaller, S., Pany-Habsa, D., & Scholger, M. (Eds.). (2020). *Schreibforschung interdisziplinär. Praxis – Prozess – Produkt*. Transcript.

Lessons from the pandemic: Repositioning writing in language learning contexts

Daniel Portman, Monica Broido

The pandemic, with its emergency move to online teaching, has compelled faculty to reassess learning goals and rethink teaching strategies in additional language learning contexts. This unexpected upheaval has brought many positive changes; the principal being the saliency of writing in language courses as a means of facilitating the learning process. Writing, which had been traditionally relegated to “learning to write” tasks, has now moved to the forefront, promoting writing-to-learn-language (WLL) and socializing students into disciplines through writing-to-learn-content (WLC) (Manchón, 2011). In our teaching context, we have instituted learning-to-write-content (LWC) as a means of apprenticing students into the principal genres in their disciplines.

We noticed that, even though writing now plays a larger role in all language courses, its function differs according to the level of the course; with WLL being the main driver in A1/A2 level courses and WLC/LWC for the B1/B2 level courses. At the beginning levels, writing helps solidify vocabulary, grammar, and syntactic structures, but later, with heightened proficiency, writing can aid in making visible key disciplinary genres (Coffin, 2006; Martin & Rose, 2008) with their appropriate disciplinary vocabulary in the target language. Moreover, students are apprenticed into producing successful exemplars of these genres.

This talk will illustrate points in the WLL-WLC/LWC progression through two different learning contexts: A1 Spanish for an interdisciplinary audience given at a large university and B1 English for Engineering given at a small engineering college. As the pandemic has allowed practitioners to step back and revisit language curricula, we hope our WLL-WLC/LWC model will hopefully aid in systematically integrating writing at different levels.

References

Coffin, C. (2006). *Historical discourse: The language of time, cause and evaluation*. Continuum.

Manchón, R.M. (2011). Situating the Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn dimensions of L2 writing. In R.M. Manchón (Ed.), *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language* (pp. 3-14). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Martin, J.R., & Rose, D. (2008). *Genre relations: mapping culture*. Equinox Publishing Ltd.

Daniel Portman
Azrieli College of Engineering Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel
Dr. Daniel Portman is a lecturer at the Azrieli College of Engineering Jerusalem, where he teaches and researches EAP/ESP. Daniel serves as the head of an English for engineering special interest group under the Higher Education in Israel Network of English Teachers (H-INET). He is a member of the Israel Council for Higher Education committee supporting CEFR implementation at tertiary institutes throughout Israel as well as the Israel Forum for Academic Writing (IFAW). His research interests include tertiary students' transitioning from student to professional and ESP needs of professionals.

Monica Broido
Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel
Monica Broido is Head of the Academic Writing Programs at Tel Aviv University, where she teaches academic/science writing to PhD students in several faculties. She also created an online writing course for all the university's graduate populations and faculty. In addition, she is presently co-chair of the Israel Forum for Academic Writing (IFAW) at the Mofet Institute. Her research interests include curriculum planning and educational technology implementation at the tertiary level.

Responding to changing circumstances: Writing fellows as support for digital introductory lectures

Ute Reimers

At the German university investigated in this contribution, academic writing support is, firstly, regarded as the subject teachers' responsibility. Secondly, it is supposed to be provided at an early stage of the university students' academic careers. However, subject teachers feel overwhelmed with consulting and supervising each student individually in their increasingly crowded introductory courses in terms of both subject and writing matters. On top of this, restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic have forced them to put extra effort into converting their seminars into a digital format since summer term 2020. Both factors oblige lecturers to focus on subject issues - their main profession - so that writing skills remain rather neglected.

An approach that seemed a promising basis in order to solve the dilemma described above, is the so-called writing fellow program. Since 2013, it has been well-established at numerous German universities. It comprises a concept for fostering writing across the curriculum through specially trained students that support particular subject courses. These writing fellows give the course participants written and oral feedback on their first drafts of a particularly designed writing task (Dreyfürst, Liebetanz & Voigt, 2018).

In this talk, I will present the design and realisation of a pilot project conducted in winter term 2020. We adapted the writing fellow program to an online lecture series that comprises approximately 80 students and 12 different lecturers, each of whom covers one session of the course. In particular, I will use insights gained from our evaluations to start fruitful discussions about (1) how writing support can be implemented a) in large subject courses, b) at the beginning of university students' academic careers, as well as c) in a digital format and (2) how writing fellows could make a key difference in such contexts.

References:

Dreyfürst, S., Liebetanz, F., & Voigt, A. (2018). *Das Writing Fellow Programm. Ein Praxishandbuch zum Schreiben in der Lehre*. WBV.

Ute Reimers

University of Siegen, Siegen, Germany

Ute Reimers is a lecturer of applied linguistics at Siegen University/Germany since 2015 and a certified writing coach since 2016. Together with her colleague, she commits herself to establishing a writing center at the University of Siegen. A first step towards this goal constitutes a pilot project comprising two steps: (1) An intense peer-tutor-training in academic writing that took place in winter term 2019 and summer term 2020, and (2) an innovative writing-fellow-project in which the trained peer-tutors support 80 first-year students in their writing tasks for a digital lecture series during the COVID-19 pandemic in winter term 2020.

Transforming STEM education with writing threshold concepts: Genre, audience and peer review in a physics curriculum

Rachel Riedner, William J. Briscoe, Alexander van der Horst, Gary Dane White, Carol Hayes

This teaching session presents assignments and curricular design elements that George Washington University’s physics faculty have developed and implemented for three years with the support of writing studies colleagues to teach genre and audience to undergraduate students. This support involves introducing concepts from writing studies, discussion of curricular design, and collaboration with assignment development. The presentation takes its material from an award-winning* curricular transformation in the physics department at GW, describing how assignments that build from the threshold concepts of genre and audience help support student learning, engagement, and disciplinary identity (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015). It describes the sequenced curriculum where physics written and oral communication genres are first taught and later reinforced. In terms of the threshold concept of genre, the poster describes how physics faculty now explicitly teach students a process for how to write in STEM genres that are new to them. Faculty do so by providing examples of the types of abstracts, proposals, or posters that they then ask students to analyze and imitate. In terms of audience, the poster describes the structured peer review activities faculty have developed to teach students to attend more closely to the differences in communicating with physics-specific versus general audiences. The overall curricular goal is to teach students that learning how to write and communicate in disciplinary genres, and to STEM and general audiences, is central to their training, and that these are skills that can be practiced and learned (Ericsson, 2006; Kellogg & Whiteford, 2009). The presentation argues that an appropriately designed physics curriculum, strategically built including threshold concepts from writing studies, can support the teaching of writing and, with support, physics faculty can do this teaching (Poe, Lerner & Craig, 2010; Riedner, Briscoe, van der Horst, Hayes & White, 2020). In conclusion, we discuss a collaborative longitudinal and comparative research that measures learning outcomes in the new curriculum.

References

Adler-Kassner, L., & Wardle, E. (2015). *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies*. Utah State UP.

Ericsson, K.A. (2009). The influence of experience and deliberate practice on the development of superior expert performance. In K. Ericsson, N. Charness, P. Feltovich, & R. Hoffman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance* (pp. 685-705). Cambridge UP.

Kellogg, R., & Whiteford, A. (2009). Training advanced writing skills: The case for deliberate practice. *Educational psychologist*, 44 (4), 250-266.

Poe, M, Lerner, N., & Craig, J. (2010). *Learning to communicate in science and engineering: Case studies from MIT*. MIT Press.

Riedner, R. C., Briscoe, B., van der Horst, A., Hayes, C., & White, G. (2020). Collaborating between Writing and STEM: Teaching Disciplinary Genres, Researching Disciplinary Interventions, and Engaging Science Audiences. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 10(1), (pp. 223).

Rachel Riedner
Professor of Writing and Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA
Dr. Rachel Riedner is Professor of Writing and of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at The George Washington University where she serves as Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Over the past few years, Dr. Riedner has collaborated with STEM colleagues to integrate writing into course design and curriculum. These collaborations have led her to develop research interests in writing in STEM, resulting in a National Science Foundation grant that studies identity formation of engineers through writing and a research project on genre and audience with physics faculty. Dr. Riedner is also a scholar of feminist rhetorical theory and feminist activism.

William J. Briscoe
Professor of Physics, George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA
Dr. William J. Briscoe is Professor of Physics and Director of Graduate Studies within the GW department of physics. He was named APS Fellow in 2005 for significant contributions to the understanding of pionic and electromagnetic interactions with nucleons and nuclei, fundamental symmetries such as time-reversal invariance and charge symmetry, and the design and construction of the JLab Tagged Photon Facility. As former chair and as part of the APS PIPELINE incentive he initiated a program to reinvent the physics major with an emphasis on communication to give students skills for the workforce and to develop innovative and entrepreneurial mindsets.

Alexander van der Horst
Associate Professor of Astrophysics, George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA
Dr. Alexander van der Horst is an Associate Professor of Astrophysics and Director of Undergraduate Studies of the GW physics department. His astrophysics research focuses on the observations and modeling of a variety of cosmic transients, related to massive stellar explosions, neutron stars and black holes. He is leading the curricular revisions of the GW physics undergraduate programs, emphasizing the development of career skills including written communication. He has developed two courses as part of the capstone experience, in collaboration with writing faculty, and including threshold concepts of writing studies.

Gary Dane White
Adjunct Professor of Physics, George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA
Gary Dane White is the Editor of *The Physics Teacher*, a peer-reviewed journal devoted to the teaching of introductory physics, and Adjunct Professor of Physics at The George Washington University. His current research interests include physics pedagogy, rolling marbles on curved spandex surfaces, and rolling unfair dice on flat, non-spandex surfaces. Most recently he has been working to better understand how to improve the writing and self-assessment skills for physics undergraduates in the upper level curriculum. He is a Fellow of the American Physical Society (APS) and of the American Association of Physics Teachers (AAPT).

Carol Hayes
Assistant Professor of Writing, George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA
Dr. Carol Hayes is an Assistant Professor of Writing and Director of the Writing Center at The George Washington University. She teaches both first-year writing and a writing-intensive course that teaches undergraduate tutors how to support students writing across the disciplines. Her research focuses on writing transfer, writing development and instruction, writing in the STEM disciplines, and genre awareness, and has appeared in *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, *Composition Forum* and several edited collections. In 2011, she began working with a multi-institutional research team on the Writing Transfer Project, which continues to develop and research genre-based teaching of writing.

Using pictures of academic writing to illustrate academic writing processes for postgraduate and early career researchers

Christine Tulley

A variety of academic writing support tools have recently emerged within the past ten years as the discipline of academic writing develops. These include support texts such as *How to Write Your Journal Article in 12 Weeks* and *Stylish Academic Writing*, coaching companies (UK-based Prolifiko, US-based Defend&Publish, and Scientific Knowledge Services based in Munich, Sofia, Budapest, and Zagreb), websites (for example, Manchester University's AcademicPhrasebank) and even conferences such as EATAW. Despite the range of resources available to postgraduate and early career researchers, novice academic writers still struggle with understanding what the process of academic writing “looks” like as it happens. During research for my own academic writing guide (*How Writing Faculty Write*) I realized that most of the writing support offered to European and US writers was textual and description based.

In 2020, I began documenting my own academic writing process in pictures and posting these on Twitter 2-3 times a week in order to teach postgraduates I work with how I was writing in an academic process in real time as I wrote a scholarly monograph. Each picture shows a screenshot of how to revise or how I used a whiteboard to organize content along with a short tip and description others can follow. These pictures can be seen at #whatfacultywritinglookslike on Twitter. This model of using pictures to show small academic writing processes as they unfold (and using Twitter as a residence of writing support) has worked well to help postgraduate researchers understand how to problem solve as they write as showing these visual examples demystifies the writing process. Evidence from my postgraduate courses showed that students began trying some of the strategies from the pictures as a means to problem solve their own writing issues once they saw how I tried to solve my own academic writing challenges (for example, reorganize a chapter visually on a whiteboard). This research is useful for instructors of academic writing seeking new models of conveying how writing works to postgraduate students or for those who offer programming for early career researchers.

References

- Belcher, W. (2019). *How to write your journal article in 12 weeks*. University of Chicago Press.
- Defend & Publish. (2021, March 8). *Is hiring a writing coach right for you?*
<http://www.defendandpublish.com/>
- Manchester University. (2019, April 2). Academic phrasebank.
<https://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk/>
- Prolifko. (2020, April 9). *Stop procrastinating, start writing*. <http://prolifiko.com/>
- Scientific Knowledge Services (2020, March 17). *What is SKS all about?*
<https://www.knowledge.services/>
- Sword, H. (2012). *Stylish academic writing*. Harvard University Press.
- Tulley, C. (2018). *How writing faculty write: Strategies for process, product, and productivity*. Utah State University Press.

Christine Tulley

The University of Findlay, Findlay, USA
 Christine Tulley is the author of *How Writing Faculty Write* (2018), the forthcoming *Rhet Comp Moms: What 150 Time Use Diaries Can Teach Us about Parenting, Productivity, and Professionalism* from Utah State University Press, and contributes regularly to *Inside Higher Education* on faculty productivity issues. She has served as a research adviser with Prolifiko, a writing productivity think tank in the UK, to address faculty writing challenges across various career stages. She also is a senior writing coach with academic writing support company Defend and Publish and featured speaker with US-based Textbook and Academic Author's Association.

Making the transformation in academic writing: Some strategies for students from Asian backgrounds

Cindy Wee

The notion of the “threshold concept” (Meyer & Land, 2003) can be used to examine strategies for inducting Asian students into Western academic writing practices. A threshold concept is integral to a given discipline; it functions as a portal, and creates a new way of thinking about key topics in that discipline. In academic writing, for learners to progress, they must understand threshold concepts in terms of academic literacy and make transformational progress from their literacy background to a Western way of writing. It involves learning and overcoming some troublesome knowledge influenced by the Asian students’ pedagogy of teaching and learning and cultural background (Green, 2007; Loh & Teo, 2017; Zhang, 2018).

This presentation reports on the author’s practices in using appropriate strategies to assist Asian students, particularly international students from China, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan, to cross the threshold of Western academic writing conventions. It begins by considering the shared practices of Asian academic writing style, which these students have to start from when learning to write in a Western education context. It will discuss the significant differences between the Asian and Western writing conventions that writing teachers need to be aware of. It then shares strategies in terms of explicit teaching the features of Western academic writing, modelling of writing coherent academic texts, helping students develop critical thinking, paraphrasing and summarising skills, and showing students how to use proper referencing systems. Finally, the presentation concludes with feedback from students and sample lessons/resources that the author uses to assist students in making the transformation in their academic writing.

References

- Green, W. (2007). Write on or write off? An exploration of Asian international students’ approaches to essay writing at an Australian university, *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(3), 329-344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360701494336>
- Loh, C. Y. R., & Teo, T. C. (2017). Understanding Asian students’ learning styles, cultural influence and learning strategies. *Journal of Education & Social Policy*, 7(1), 194-210. https://www.jespnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_1_March_2017/23.pdf
- Meyer, J. H. F., & Land, R. (2003). *Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: Linkages to ways of thinking and practising within the disciplines*. ETL Project (Occasional Report 4.). <http://www.etl.tla.ed.ac.uk/docs/ETLreport4.pdf>
- Zhang, Z. (2018). Academic writing difficulty of Chinese students: The cultural issue behind Chinese and British academic writing styles. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 17, 118-124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/10570>

Cindy Wee

Unitec Institute Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

Cindy Wee is a Learning Development Lecturer at the Unitec Institute of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand. She teaches embedded academic writing workshops in the Schools of Computing, Early Childhood Education, and Applied Technology. She also provides consultations in the area of academic writing with students one-to-one, mainly from Asian backgrounds.

Cindy is interested in online learning, peer learning, collaborative learning, teaching academic writing, and teaching English as a second language at the tertiary level.

“Wisely and slow”: An exploration of slowness in the teaching of academic writing

Stuart Wrigley

Inspired by the work of philosopher Michelle Boulous Walker, this paper explores the possibilities of “slow philosophy” (Boulous Walker, 2017) in the teaching of academic writing. Although not a new pedagogical approach, “slowness” has not been widely applied to teaching academic writing. Indeed, mainstream academic writing teaching pedagogy tends to reflect, respond to, and support the day-to-day reality of student writing, involving (as it does) multiple deadlines, efficient searching, ruthless information-extraction, and the writing of highly structured, plan-based texts. Such an approach has been criticised for failing to promote deep learning (e.g. Campbell & Latimer, 2012; Warner, 2020). This problem has been made worse in the context of Covid-19, with home-based students struggling to carve out space and time for writing and thinking amidst the competing commitments of family, work and care-giving (Kulkarni & Chima, 2020).

In this paper, I argue that this enforced haste is an example of what Boulous Walker (2017) critiques as an institutional, forensic “desire to know”, that is, a mainstream philosophical approach to academic work that emphasises output, ruthless information-extraction, speed and efficiency. Boulous Walker’s aim is to reclaim philosophy’s true roots as a “love of wisdom” by making time to engage in the kind of slow and mindful thinking and reading (“reading against the institution”) required for deep intellectual work. My intention is to open up for discussion a potential research space by applying this “slow philosophy” approach to student writing, thus paving the way for a set of pedagogical applications that promote a “love of wisdom” and deep learning in academic writing.

References

- Boulous Walker, M. (2017). *Slow philosophy*. Bloomsbury.
- Campbell, K. H., & Latimer, K. (2012). *Beyond the five-paragraph essay*. Stenhouse Publishers.
- Kulkarni, S., & Chima, P. (2021). Challenges faced by UK university students due to the coronavirus crisis in higher education. *Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202102.0192.v1>
- Warner, J. (2020). *Why they can’t write: Killing the five-paragraph essay and other necessities*. John Hopkins University Press.

Stuart Wrigley

Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, UK

I am a Teaching Fellow at Royal Holloway’s Centre for Development of Academic Skills, with a professional interest in academic literacy, student writing development, peer tutoring and the writing process more generally. I support students in their academic endeavours and work closely with the School of Law and Social Sciences to develop academic literacy and learning enhancement provision. I am also working on a PhD in nineteenth-century history, with a focus on Anglo-German cultural relations.

Teaching writing for diverse audiences to doctoral students: An SFL-informed approach

Nadya Yakovchuk

Communicating science to professional audiences and wider society is an important part of the role of a researcher. Doctoral students need to develop the ability to communicate their research effectively to a variety of specialist and non-specialist audiences with confidence, clarity and impact. In this presentation, I will share a pedagogical tool for a genre-based approach to teaching writing for diverse audiences to doctoral students that can help them engage effectively with their intended audiences in a variety of formats.

Informed by Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory (Eggins, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014) and inspired by its pedagogical applications (in particular, Monbec's (2020) "table of instantiation"), this tool reflects the idea of language as a system of choices that writers have to make in specific rhetorical situations to achieve specific communicative purposes. The tool is flexible in nature and has been used, in different forms, in workshops on writing for public engagement, writing with impact for professional audiences, as well as more "traditional" sessions on academic writing targeted at doctoral students. In this presentation, I will outline the steps I usually follow to introduce both the tool and the broader rhetorical considerations when writing for diverse audiences. I will then share some ideas for how the tool can be used to deconstruct texts in different genres and scaffold students' subsequent writing processes. This presentation will be suitable for participants with or without specialist knowledge of SFL, and particularly for those who work with doctoral students and researchers.

References

- Eggins, S. (1994). *An introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Continuum.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Monbec, L. (2020). Systemic Functional Linguistics for the EGAP module: Revisiting the common core. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100794>

Nadya Yakovchuk

University of Surrey, UK

Dr Nadya Yakovchuk works as a Teaching Fellow in Academic Writing at the University of Surrey, UK. She is based at the Doctoral College and provides writing skills training for PhD students and early career researchers. Nadya's professional interests include writing and knowledge construction in the disciplines, genre-based writing pedagogy, writing transfer between academic and professional settings, academic writers' identity and authorial voice, and corpus linguistics and Systemic Functional Linguistics applications to the teaching of academic writing. She is a Senior Fellow of the Higher Education Academy.



This Book of Abstracts was produced within the Project
TL01000274 Publish and Flourish: Publication Activity
Support for PhD Students and their Supervisors with
the state support of the Technology Agency of the CR.

**11th Conference of the European Association for the Teaching of the Academic Writing
book of abstracts**

VYSOKÁ ŠKOLA BÁŇSKÁ-TECHNICKÁ UNIVERZITA OSTRAVA
Faculty of Mining and Geology

Edited by:

Alena Kašpárková
Dáša Frančíková
Kamila Etchegoyen Rosolová

ISBN 978-80-248-4555-5

© VŠB-TUO, Ostrava, 2021

EATAW
2021 65